

JOHN XXIII “BLESSED”, TOO?

Open Letter to the Episcopate by Father [Dr] Luigi Villa

The Italians have a saying *traduttore traditore*, ‘to translate is to betray’. The axiom is certainly true of ham-fisted efforts that produce a literal, rather than idiomatic, rendering of what is said in the original language. This is the case with the translation into English of the Italian monograph of Fr Luigi Villa, his *Open Letter to the Episcopate* concerning the proposal to beatify Angelo Guiseppe Cardinal Roncalli who became Pope John XXIII.

What is set out below is a re-rendering in idiomatic English of a translation of Fr Villa’s letter currently available. The present writer has not seen the original Italian, and is not competent to translate from that language. He has aimed to reproduce the sense of the letter. Because the direction of Fr Villa’s argument is not always clear, the writer has taken some liberties with the text, though never so as to controvert what Fr Villa appears to be saying.

Fr Villa was an associate of Padre Pio who commissioned him to controvert the influence of Freemasonry generally and, in particular, its influence on innumerable of the Church’s bishops and priests. A biography of Fr Villa with a summary of his works is available at - <https://ephesians51ublog.com/2015/08/29/who-is-father-luigi-villa-by-dr-franco-adessa/>

MJB

INTRODUCTION

Most Reverend Excellency: I am beginning this script on Pope John XXIII with the question Cardinal Oddi asked himself, in 1988, in the magazine *Trenta Giorni*: “Was the ‘Papa Buono’ also a good Pope?” I make no secret... of my disappointment when [I discovered that], on December 20th, 1999, John Paul II issued the Decree in which he officially recognized John XXIII’s “heroic virtues” [‘virtues’] such as... he promoted ecumenism; he inaugurated a new approach toward the Jewish world; he created the Secretariat for the Unity of the Christians, and so on.

These ‘virtues’ are of a new breed. In the past one spoke of Faith, Hope and Charity, etc. This new inventory of virtues could not but rouse in me some perplexities, doubts, suspicions. Hence those who studied the curriculum vitae of John XXIII had the duty to analyse not a few sophisms that were present in his inaugural address [at] Vatican II which he pronounced on October 11th, 1962, namely, opening to the Freemasons, to the Protestants, to the Jews, to the Communists. These were openings that [were to] weaken the Church!

Instead, Papa Roncalli’s optimism caused him to say that those that brought to the opening of the Council were happy circumstances:

“The conditions of modern life have eliminated those innumerable obstacles by which, in the past, the sons of this world impeded the free action of the Church”.

These words are... in open contrast with [those of] St. Pius X, when he complained of a world “ill with apostasy”; [in contrast] too with [those of] Pius XI condemning the ills of atheism, and [those of] Pius XII, who spoke of this “evil spirit that won’t lay down his arms”.

[In contrast with these popes] John XXIII saw everything through rose-coloured glasses. The previous year, 1961, had seen construction of the shameful Berlin Wall and... in... 1962 there occurred the ominous Cuba crisis. He shut his eyes to Communism's tragic consequences. Already, in 1846, Pius IX [had] labelled it "[a] fatal doctrine most opposed to the natural law", and, in *Divini Redemptoris*, Pius XI had condemned it as "intrinsically perverted" adding that "no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking whatsoever".

In the month of May 1961, John XXIII spoke of the "fundamental opposition between Communism and Christianity", but shortly after he [reversed his attitude]. On his orders, in 1962, Cardinal Tisserant signed an agreement with the Metropolitan Nikodim, "spokesman for the Kremlin", facilitating the invitation of Orthodox "observers" to the Council.

Moscow was prepared to accept the invitation but on condition that no word be uttered about Communism during the Council. No surprise, then, that a petition signed by 450 of the Conciliar Fathers [during the Council's course] demanding the condemnation of Communism should mysteriously disappear. John XXIII subjected the Church to the veto of Moscow and put a shameful silence on the bloodiest and [most] criminal of totalitarianisms. And what were the fruits of John XXIII's *Ostpolitik*?

With the exception of the clamorous gesture of the release of Cardinal Slipyj [of the Ukrainian Catholic Church], there was an increase in anti-Catholic persecutions in all the Communist countries. The victims found themselves betrayed by the Vatican. In Latin America sprang up the so-called "theology of liberation", permeated with Communist ideas. It will suffice to recall what the guerrilla-priest Camillo Torres, declared—

"John XXIII authorises me to march along with the Communists".

Then, in 1963, the Pope received Khrushchev's son-in-law, Alexei Adjubei, in the Vatican. The meeting was arranged by Palmiro Togliatti [Italian Communist Party secretary], a "meeting"... that earned the Italian Communists an extra million votes in the elections that followed.

Of other sophisms in which Pope John XXIII engaged, I will only mention his odd conception of a mercy that refuses to condemn the error, and his similarly odd tendency – condemned by all preceding Popes – of promoting a vague "unity" that had nothing to do with Catholic unity, which is founded on faith and charity, but [redolent of] the Masonic unity of "universal brotherhood".

Your Excellency, I intend these few pages... to sound a new "alert" or cry, against the planned beatification on September 3rd, 2000, of Pope John XXIII. They... outline, in a swift synthesis of chronicle and history – perhaps still unknown to you – what might be termed a counter manifesto to the beatification. John XXIII was the "pope of Vatican II", "pope of the Communists", pope [who] at Vatican II "set in motion" the opening of the Church not only to Communism, but to an ongoing Masonic-styled 'ecumenism'.

Few perceived behind a kindly and simplistic countenance and personality, replete with ability and diplomatic cunning, with irony and congeniality, in his relationships with collaborators and people generally, John XXIII's reforming and progressive will.

In the hope, then, of doing something coherent with my conscience as cleric and theologian, I offer for your information these brief notes, another tessera [in] the great mosaic of the sad

history of today's Church. Should the "beatification" proceed it will not erase the mare's nest he caused, or procured as Pope, replete, as it was, with erroneous and dangerous delusions.

[When], on December 10th, 1918, Fr Roncalli returned to his diocese of Bergamo after military service, he found that things had quite changed since the time he was the bishop's omni-present secretary, and though the new bishop, Monsignor Luigi Maria Marella, still allowed him the teaching desk at the seminary (whose reputation had already been shaky) and appointed him its spiritual director (in spite of the direction, which he retained, of the Hall of Residence), he nevertheless felt "marginalised by the new Bishop" (1) and ill at ease. He was not able to enjoy the prestige had with his former bishop, Giacomo Radini-Tedeschi. Bergamo was now too small for him and he set his heart on Rome.

The Dutch cardinal Van Rossem, Prefect of *Propaganda Fide*, would put him to re-organization of the missionary works in the Italian dioceses. One might ask how could a humble seminary teacher, under suspicion of modernism (2), be installed in the Roman Curia? The surest answer is that in Rome, by now, the influence of Pius X no longer operated.

Without that lapse of influence neither Roncalli from Bergamo, nor Montini from Brescia would ever have descended on Rome.

(1) Giovanni Spinelli in "Bibliotheca Sanctorum", Voice: *Giovanni XXIII*, Prima appendice Città Nuova editrice, Rome 1987, col. 577.

(2) The suspicions were there, and they were not off the mark. This appears in the "Bibliotheca Sanctorum". It suffices to note, 1) that his priestly "models" were modernist or modernizing (ref. *Sodalitium*, n. 22, p. 1, and note 50, p. 20); 2) that his animosity against anti-modernists was evident; 3) that his work as an historian and as professor of ecclesiastical history raised suspicions, as did his anti-modernist statements; and, 4) that many activities of his Pontificate confirmed the truth of these suspicions.

NUNCIO

Father Bouyer wrote: "When, in quite an unexpected way, Monsignor Roncalli was parachuted into Paris as Nuncio, Dom Lambert Beauduin [Benedictine, disciplined for fiddling with the Church's liturgy] called on him, not without asking himself whether Giuseppe Roncalli, ring on his finger, purple vest on his shoulders, would still recognise his humiliated brother. His doubts were soon dispelled. He had scarcely handed over his calling card when he heard, from the antechamber, that familiar voice: "Come on in, Lamberto! Come on in!" An instant later, he experienced one of those warm embraces for which Roncalli would be famous. Before he could grasp what was passing, he heard the Nuncio say, "Come! Take a seat and tell me all about your adventures".

Beauduin climbed a step and found himself installed on a particularly narrow seat, his interlocutor sitting opposite laughing heartily. Beauduin began with the narration of his Roman tribulations, gradually coming to the realisation that he was doing so from the height of the Papal

throne which is a feature in the Legation residences. He could hardly envision how so grotesque a situation would take on symbolic significance. (1) For during the Council John XXIII would enthrone each of theologians Pius XII had condemned. It must not be forgotten that Don Ernesto Bonaiuti, defrocked excommunicated head of the Italian Modernists, Roncalli's seminary friend, had assisted at his First Mass. (2) Bonaiuti died on April 26, 1946 while Roncalli was in Paris without repentance or the Sacraments. Roncalli wrote:

"Dead in such a way, then, at 65, *sine luce e sine cruce*. His admirers wrote of him he was an intensely and profoundly religious spirit, adhering to Christianity with all of his fibres, clinging by indestructible bonds to his beloved Catholic Church. Naturally, there was not an ecclesiastic to bless his body, not a temple to receive his burial! Words from his spiritual testament, between the 18th and 19th March 1946, 'I may have erred but I cannot find in the substance of my teaching any matter for retraction'. *Dominus parcat illi!*"

His last words for Bonaiuti, an absolution! (3)

Bonaiuti's death did not mark the end of Modernism. Its objective was always to modernize, to revise the Church, to reconcile her with progress and modern civilization. (4) Roncalli relegated dogma to the background, infiltrating his ideas in pastoral fashion through movements liturgical, biblical, ecumenical. In the social field he promoted Marxism, using the more 'progressive' bishops to secure concessions from Rome. The leader of the progressive bishops was Emanuel Célestin Cardinal Suhard [Archbishop of Paris 1940-9]. He went as far as to write a pastoral letter (*Essor ou déclin de l'Eglise*) to denounce the danger of integrism, the movement for the defence of the Faith promoted, blessed and financed by St. Pius X. The letter displeased Pius XII, [who saw it as] the "manifestation of the new emerging Church". (5)

Roncalli's relationship with Suhard is illustrated by Roncalli himself:

"Nearly five years of spiritual contacts between us had sealed a fraternity of sentiment that no shadow, not even the faintest, ever came to upset. Such was our mutual understanding!" (6)

Hence, he too was "open to the modern world", a believer in the necessity of dialogue between Catholics and Communists, of doing away with excommunications. He, too, was for a renewal of the Church at every level, for a livelier and more active laity, for a priesthood in line with modern life. Several of Suhard's ideas were to find their way into the "Giovannean" pontificate.

After the French revolution, in his view, the Catholic world had been drifting away from Christ. The modern world was "out of the fold of Christ", (7) a "land of mission". The thought obsessed Cardinal Suhard [who went further]:

"There is a wall separating the Church from the Mass. That wall must be levelled at any cost."

The Dominican Fr Loew provided the first example [of the 'worker' priest] when, in 1941, he became a docker at Marseilles. (8) A year later, twenty five more priests went to work in the "Mandatory Labour Service" (STO) in Germany selected by Cardinal Suhard on advice from Fr Jean-Marie Leblond. The outcome defied all expectations.

Pius XI, in his encyclical *Divini Redemptoris* (1937), had declared "Communism... intrinsically perverted and no collaboration with it could be permitted". On February 5, 1949, however, Cardinal Suhard published a statement in which he announced "habitual and close collaboration with Communism". (9)

At this juncture, Roncalli entered the scene with the mediation of Monsignor Montini. *L'Osservatore Romano* of 31st March 1949 praises the "Paris Mission" and Cardinal Suhard who [it

asserts] “takes full responsibility for it”. The Roman Curia was by now divided with Monsignor Ottaviani and the Holy Office on one side, and Monsignor Montini [and those who agreed with him] on the other. These two coalitions (orthodox and heterodox) would line up later at the Council.

The predilections of Monsignor Roncalli passed to the French hierarchy. He approved the “experiment of the working priests”; (10) he was “very fond of the working priests”. (11) In 1951 Rome ordered a stop to recruitment. Many ‘working priests’ had opted for ‘the class struggle’, quit the priesthood and abandoned celibacy. Roncalli’s successor, Monsignor Marella, had the remainder [of the working priests] summoned by their superiors, and on June 30th, 1949 Pius XII signed the Decree of excommunication of the Communists by the Holy Office. Monsignor Roncalli disappears, leaving interpretation of the Decree to others. Later, Pius XII complained of Roncalli’s absence from Paris in such critical moments. He said to Marella, Roncalli’s successor at the Nunciature, “above all, don’t behave like your predecessor who was never there”. (12).

Roncalli went looking for a successor for Cardinal Suhard [who had died May 30th, 1949]. He found Monsignor Feltin, President of the movement *Pax Christi*, a Communist front. Hebblethwaite admits that it was Monsignor Feltin who inspired the content of John XXIII’s *Pacem in Terris*!

There is another side to Roncalli. He was always somewhat gluttonous, and had been so since his childhood. [In this he seems to have emulated] his bishop, Radini-Tedeschi... “a capital epicure, [who said that] young Roncalli was not late in becoming himself a good fork” [gourmet]. Many years later, when Nuncio at Paris, a diplomat who knew him there remarked, that he became one of the most sought-after diplomats of the French capital, thanks, in part, to his enthusiasm for convivial gatherings and the excellent courses served at his table”. (13) Roncalli left a strong impression as Nuncio of worldliness – an unpleasant memory. (14)

He welcomed at his table all the exponents of Catholic progressivism, such as Mauriac - who voiced his protest when, in 1951, the Holy Office put on the Index the works of Gide (15); such as Léon Blum - the socialist Jew who, in 1934 had helped the alliance between socialists and Communists which came to power in 1936 under the name the Popular Front (16); such as Vincent Auriol - Finance minister in the first government of that Popular Front, then president of the Fourth Republic, described as “an atheist and a socialist”; such as Eduard Herriot - mayor of Lyons, President of the Council and of the Socialist Radical Party, a notorious “anti-clerical” (17), who took to its ultimate consequences the principle of laïcisme [strict separation of Church and State]. (18)

To the latter, one day, Roncalli remarked:

“There are but political opinions standing in our way. Trivialities, all in all, wouldn’t you say?”. One should keep in mind that Herriot’s policy (as well as Auriol’s) consisted also in the denial of the *Social Reign of Jesus Christ* and of the rights of the Church, [in other words] State atheism. It is inevitable, then, that Herriot should have declared: “If all the bishops were like Roncalli, there never would have been any anti-clericalism in France”. Of course not! All one has to do is accept surrender to the enemy without imposing conditions. That is why Pope Roncalli could boast of having no enemies in the French political world. (19) [The great irony is] that he failed

to see he had succeeded where Our Lord Jesus Christ had failed (20), as neither had St. Paul, (21) nor as had any good Christian. (22)

When on March 3, 1925, he was elected Archbishop of Aeropoli, and Apostolic Visitor to Bulgaria (accounting for only 62,000 Catholics), his friend Dom Lambert Beauduin O. S. B., had said:

“Roncalli has been removed from his teaching post at the Lateran as he was suspected of Modernism”. This, of course, was the reason why he had been removed, too, from the Seminary at Bergamo. The transfer... “opened the first horizons of [Monsignor Roncalli’s] future ecumenism”. (23)

Dom Beauduin had already engaged in ‘ecumenism’ with the *Orthodox*, having founded a Monastery of Union first at Amay-sur-Meuse and subsequently at Chevetogne, where he had adopted the Oriental liturgy “in order that Catholicism might no longer be confused with Latinism...” (24)

A magazine of the monastery, *Irénikon*, featured the muddle-headed ideas of this ‘ecumenism’. As Hebblethwaite demonstrates, Roncalli embraced them with enthusiasm. His first letter on ecumenism cites *Irénikon*. It is significant that the letter was addressed not to a cleric but to a lay-woman, Adelaide Coari, preoccupied with ‘ecumenical’ movements, biblical movements and women’s movements, and the fate of Ernesto Bonaiuti... Coari was interested in the union of the churches and ‘the spirit of charity’ featured in *Irénikon* which would entrust to the charity of Catholics a return of the brethren to the Catholic fold. Here is an illustration of Roncalli’s approach, to favour ‘charity’ over scientific and theological discussion, an approach anti-intellectual and derogatory of the Church’s theology.

In an issue of *Irénikon* Beauduin had developed [the thesis of] the primacy of charity. What is wanted, he wrote is “a living apologetic that requires no other miracle but love”. (25) But such ‘charity’ has nothing to do with the charity advocated by St. Paul which presupposes a right faith. Beauduin’s ‘charity’, in contrast, reflected that of the 1925 Protestant ‘ecumenist’ association given the name ‘Life and Work’ which pursued union [of the churches] not at the doctrinal level, but on the practical basis of this pseudo-charity. This was in 1927.

On January 6th, 1928, however, out came Pius XI’s encyclical *Mortalium Animos* condemning that form of ecumenism. Beauduin had to resign as a Prior of the Monastery of Amay and, in 1929, was summoned to Rome. Then, in 1932, he had another trial and was exiled to Encalcat because the first fruits of the “Monastery of the Union” which he had founded were now apparent. Not a few of the monks there had apostatized and joined the “Orthodox”.

Rome condemned Beauduin’s method. In contrast, Roncalli, after his election would say, “Dom Lambert Beauduin’s method is the good one.” Beauduin was already aware of Roncalli’s position. As noted, in 1958 he had said “If they elected Roncalli (pope), all would be saved: he would be capable of convening a Council and consecrating ecumenism” (26). Which is what happened!

Vatican II produced, on 20th September 1964, its Decree on Ecumenism, *Unitatis Redintegratio*. The formulas promoted there had been condemned by Pius XII. (27)

It is no surprise that John XXIII called to the Council as expert the Dominican Yves Congar, whose false irenicism had been condemned, as to both doctrine and method, by Pius XII. Promotion of that error had been the principal interest of Monsignor Roncalli when he was in the Balkans.

In Turkey, in a conference the [Turkish] undersecretary of foreign affairs, Numan Rifat Menemengioglu, had said to him, “Laïcisme [separation of Church and State] is one of our fundamental principles”. Monsignor Roncalli had replied: “The Church shall be careful not to affect or discuss such laïcisme”. This was a very grave assertion from a representative of Pius XI who, in his encyclical *Quas Primas* (6th December 1925) on the Social Reign of Jesus Christ, had written:

“the plague infecting society (...), the plague of our time, is the demand for separation of Church and State, its errors and its impious attempts.”

We Catholics believe that, in the Blessed Trinity, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and from the Son (*qui ex Patre Filioque procedit*), not from the Father alone. We chant it in the Creed at Mass and in the *Tantum Ergo* during Benediction (*procedenti ab utroque*). But Roncalli’s pastoral and ecumenical line took a contrasting position. This became apparent through various acts, such as his cancellation of the “Filioque” ... on the entrance of the Apostolic Delegation” (28). Moreover, he multiplied meetings with the members of the “Orthodox” hierarchy. Having Greece, too, under his jurisdiction, a country with an anti-Catholic legislation, following a meeting, in Athens, between Orthodox and Anglicans, in which the validity of the Holy Orders of the Anglican Church was acknowledged [by the Orthodox], Monsignor Roncalli, instead of reacting – with a reference to Leo XIII’s sentence [in the bull *Apostolicae Curae*, September 15th, 1896, that Anglican ‘orders’ were invalid] – came out with, “ I do not regret that our separated brothers have made the first step toward unity” (29).

1 D. Bonnetterre, “Le mouvement liturgique”, *Fideliter* 1980, p. 112-113; from L. Bouyer, “Dom Lambert Beauduin, un homme d’Eglise” Castermann 1964, p. 180-181.

2 “Sodalitium” n. 22, p. 14-15.

3 Hebblethwaite, “John XXIII, the Pope of the Council”, Italian Edition, Rusconi, 1989, p. 669-670.

4 It is the 80th proposition condemned by the “Syllabus” of Pius IX - Denz. S. 2980.

5 Hebblethwaite, cited work, 313.

6 Letter to monsignor Pierre Brot, auxiliary bishop to cardinal Suhard, quoted in Hebblethwaite, p. 318.

7 Encyclical “*Humani Generis*”, Pius XII.

8 H. Jedin, “History of the Church”, Jaca Book 1975, vol. XI, p. 221-225.

9 Quoted in Hebblethwaite, p. 315.

10 Wilton Wynn, “The Custodians of the Kingdom”, Frassinelli 1989, p. 50.

11 Alden Hatch, “John XXIII”, Mursia 1964, p. 132.

12 Max Bergerre, “Four Popes and a Journalist”, Edizioni Paoline 1978, p. 70.

13 Wynn, “The Custodians of the Kingdom” Italian Edition, Frassinelli, 1989, p. 47.

14 “Sodalitium”, November 1991, p. 20.

15 Hebblethwaite “John XXIII, the Pope of the Council”, Italian Edition, Rusconi, 1989, p. 309-317-318.

16 Glorney Bolton, “The Pope”, Edizioni Longanesi 1970, p. 240.

17 Hatch Alden Hatch, “John XXIII”, Italian Edition, Mursia 1967, p. 128.

18 Renzo Allegri, “The Pope Who Changed the World”, Edizioni Bolzano, 1988, p. 100.

19 A. Lazzarini, “Jean XXIII”, Mulhouse 1959, p. 99.

- 20 John XVII, 14.
- 21 Galatians 1, 10: «For if I were still pleasing men, I wouldn't be a servant of Christ.»
- 22 John XV, 20: «If they persecuted me, they will also persecute you.»
- 23 Giovanni Spinelli, Voice: “John XXIII”, in: “Biblioteca Sanctorum”, Appendix One, Città Nuova Edizioni, Rome, 1987, col. 578.
- 24 Louis Bouyer, *Dom Lambert Beauduin, un homme d'Eglise*, Castermann, 1964, p. 133-135. 25 *Irénikon*, June-July 1928, p. 229.
- 26 Louis Bouyer, *Dom Lambert Beauduin, un homme d'Eglise*, Casterman, 1964, p. 135-36 and 180-181.
- 27 I would have you read, for example, the concept of imperfect communion (*Unitatis redintegratio*, n. 3) between Catholic Church and non-Catholic sects, and the statement that the latter are however means of “salvation” (*Unitatis redintegratio*, n. 3).
- 28 Giovanni Spinelli, cited work, col. 579.
- 29 Father Paolo Tanzella SCJ. “Pope John”, Edizioni Dehoniane, Andria 1973, p. 138-139.

CARDINAL

On November 14, 1952, Montini wrote [to Roncalli asking] whether, in the event of the death of the Patriarch of Venice, Monsignor Carlo Agostini, who was gravely ill, he would be ready to succeed him. Following his [Roncalli's] consent, a telegram, again from Montini, announced his appointment as Cardinal in the upcoming Consistory of 12 January 1953. Roncalli succeeded as Patriarch on December 28th. In his speech of 15th March 1953 at St. Mark's Basilica on the day of his arrival, he would say he “always more cared about that which unites than about that which separates and generates contrasts”. (1) This was a real ‘ecumenist’ speech, in the sense explained by the Mason, Baron Marsaudon (2), Monsignor Roncalli had already used [a similar expression] with the representative of the Turkish Government, Numan Rifat Menengiöglü: “I’m an optimist. I always seek in anything to develop that which unites rather than that which draws apart”. (3) That would become his emblematic phrase, his inspiring principle.

Paul VI, in his first encyclical *Ecclesiam Suam*, the encyclical of “dialogue”, would [adopt it], “We willingly make it our principle: we emphasize, first of all, that which is common to us, before we take notice of that which divides us.”

Regrettably, the principle does not coincide with the doctrine of the Church. In the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (42-0950-142-147), for example, one reads:

“They (the bishops) 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”; (4).

What to Paul VI was a “principle”, to the Holy Office was that very “false pretext”. Cardinal Roncalli, too, thus supported a “principle” which the Holy Office three years earlier had condemned as “false”. The principle was applied “to people of different religions and ideologies”, namely, infidels, heretics, schismatic, atheists, Masons, Communists, etc.

What does unite us? Human reason. What separates us? Different faiths. It is an aberration to place purely human, natural values on a higher plane than the supernatural. Since the things that divide us are the principles of the Catholic Creed and morals, Roncalli's clarification—

“[yet this does not compromise] adherence to the principles of the Catholic Creed and of morals”—makes no sense. This mode of speech sugars the pill to make it more palatable. It is the tactic adopted at Vatican II where a similar locution was used to justify [the assertion of a right to]

“religious Freedom” with the declaration that there would be no alteration to traditional doctrine when, in fact, it reversed the entire Tradition of the Church on the topic.

The Masonic Grand Master, Di Bernardo, speaking of “tolerance” says something similar. It is—
“an approach that, even rejecting, in line of principle, an erroneous way of thinking, allows it to subsist on account of the respect due to others’ freedom”. (5)

That is, the Mason “is not indifferent toward other ways of thinking; Freemasonry is not... the contrary of all”. It is “by its own nature, not exclusivist or pluralist”. Therefore we may characterise Cardinal Roncalli’s position as “Masonic” regardless of [whether he was ever] initiated in a Lodge. He was “open” to all (other religions, ideologies...) as, in religion, he was open to ‘ecumenism’ and, in politics, open to the left.

From the 1920s he was an ecumenist, not in the traditional theological sense of that term, but in the sense that would come to characterize the Council and which brought him to say, during a conference he held at Palermo on September 18th, 1957 on the “Christian Orient,

“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”. (6)

In so speaking he ignored the fact that Pius IX had already condemned the thesis, remarking that the deliberations of the Popes showed that it led to schism (7).

1 Writings and Speeches of Cardinal Angelo G. Roncalli, Edizioni Paoline, Rome 1959-1963, pp. 207-210.

2 Yves Marsaudon, ³L'Oecumenisme vu par un Franc-Maçon de Tradition, Edition Vitiano, Paris 1965.

3 Paolo Tanzella, SCJ, Pope John, Edizioni Dehoniane, Andria 1973, p. 132.

4 Instruction of the Holy Office on the ecumenical movement of 20-22 December 1949. Jean Chélin, *L'Eglise sous Pie XII*, Fayard 1989, vol. II, p. 106.

5 The Philosophy of Freemasonry, in *Sodalitium* n. 24, pp. 3-8.

6 Hebblethwaite, cited work, p. 374.

7 Apostolic Letter *Ad Apostolicae*, 22 August 1851; Syllabus

8 December 1864, proposition 38 Ds 2938.

POPE

To begin with, let us ask ourselves: how did it ever occur to Roncalli to convene a Council? And what was to be its purpose? In an Allocution to the Venetian pilgrims of May 8, 1962, John XXIII revealed that the idea occurred to him, suddenly, during a colloquy with his Secretary of State (1). He is even more categorical in his ‘spiritual Diary:

‘Without giving it a thought, there popped out, in a first discussion with my Secretary of State, on January 20, 1959, the words Ecumenical Council...’ (2)

And that is what everyone believed. This assertion moved Paul VI to claim, on September 29th, 1963, that the Ecumenical Council had been convened and initiated by divine direction. (3) Pope John Paul II would make a similar statement on November 25th, 1981: ...

“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...” (4)

That was the official version, but it was completely false, a falsity that, today, historians have come to accept, even though they hesitate to call Roncalli a liar. (5) Even the Jesuit father Giacomo Martina says so:

“According to the *Giornale dell’Anima* and to a speech of May 8th, 1962, John XXIII would have conceived the intention (of convening a Council) as a result of a sudden inspiration which struck him during a discussion with his Secretary of State, Cardinal Tardini, on January 20th, 1959. The autobiographical statement (which gives vent to singular issues as to the reliability of *Giornale dell’Anima* and the character of the Pope) is, however, contradicted by many testimonies, several of which have their source in the Pope himself”. (6)

There are indications - more than indications, in fact - that prior to January 20, 1959, Roncalli was thinking of a Council, and this even before he was elected Pope. Let us again recall the “testimony” of his friend (since 1924), Dom Lambert Beauduin, who said on the death of Pius XII, “If they elected Roncalli, all would be saved: he would be capable of convening a Council and consecrate ecumenism”. (7)

Cardinal Ottaviani stated, on at least two occasions (in 1968 and 1975), that a Council had been discussed during the Conclave prior to Roncalli’s election. Cardinals Ottaviani and Ruffini, in the company of others, called at Monsignor’s Roncalli’s cell on the night of 27th October 1958 in order to propose to him an ecumenical Council. (8) And Roncalli, according to Ottaviani, appropriated the idea.

Two days after his election, on October 30th, John XXIII spoke to his Secretary, Capovilla, of the “necessity of convening a Council”. And even before his coronation, on November 2nd, after granting an audience to Cardinal Ruffini and discussing the issue, he again said to Capovilla, “A Council is wanted”. He discussed it with [his replacement as] Patriarch of Venice, Giovanni Cardinal Urbani, in November and, subsequently, with the Bishop of Padua, Girolamo Bordignon.

[There were other reports.] “On November 28th, the decision is taken”, and “Pope John XXIII’s decision of holding a Council becomes final in the December of 1958”. Around Christmas he discussed it with his confessor, Monsignor Cavagna, together with three other people. On the morning of January 9th, he met Monsignor Giovanni Rossi, of *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 institute a Council”.

Monsignor Rossi, for a time, kept Roncalli’s confession to himself, then he made mention of it in his bulletin, *La Rocca* of 15th January 1958. (9)

Therefore, when he said that the idea of a Council had fallen upon him during a colloquy with his Secretary of State, Cardinal Tardini on January 20th following, he spoke a lie. Tardini was, indeed, one of the last to learn about it, just five days before the historical announcement. (10) And Tardini realised it was a *fait accompli*.

Father Martina comments on it, too.

It is a singular evidence of the nature of the relationship of the pope with his Secretary of State, cordial and yet shallow, that Tardini should have come to know of his intention only when the pontiff had already irrevocably made the decision and had compiled a... draft [of its content]. (11)

British journalist Wilton Wynn took the same view, as did former Jesuit, Peter Hebblethwaite.

As Secretary of State, Tardini should have been the Pope's closest collaborator but John XXIII did not work through the 'official' channels, preferring persons more consonant with his own character whom he could trust. (12) He regularly managed to circumvent Tardini, his old enemy.

Papa Roncalli was also fond of the tactic of the two tracks. When, on January 25, 1959, he went to *St. Paul's Outside the Walls*, his "face was anxious and tense". At around one pm, the function over, he had the seventeen cardinals present summoned to the capitulary hall of the Benedictine abbey. There the Pope presented an Allocutio. At its end he uttered the fatidic announcement: "My venerable Brothers of the Cardinalatial College, I pronounce, in your presence, quivering a little with emotion but with humble resoluteness of purpose, the name and the proposal of a double celebration, a Diocesan Synod for Rome and an Ecumenical Council for the Universal Church". (13)

What kind of a Council he had in mind became clear:

"... in... renewed invitation to our brothers of the separated Churches to participate with us in this feast of grace and fraternity..."

The official version of that address appeared with the following meaningful variation:

"... in renewed invitation to the faithful of the separated communities to follow us in this quest for unity and grace, which so many souls yearn for from all corners of the world".

The changes are not of little moment. The separated Christians are no longer called "brothers", or "separated Churches" but members of a "community". In lieu of "participating with us in this feast of grace and fraternity," they are exhorted to seek and follow Catholics in this quest, as though they could not do otherwise. (14) The Council to be called was not only an ecumenical one, but 'ecumenist'.

The response of the cardinals was a "remarkable and devout silence"! John XXIII "remained bitterly disappointed", as he later attested:

"One could humanly have hoped that, after hearing the allocution, the cardinals would close ranks around Us to convey their approval and good wishes". (15)

But the cardinals were bewildered and their befuddlement was shared in many other sectors, ecclesiastical and secular. Cardinal Lercaro went as far as to write:

"How dare he call a Council one hundred years after the last, and only three months after his election? Pope John reveals his imprudence and rashness". (16)

And he went on:

"Such an event will ruin the state of his already poor health, and cause the whole edifice of the moral and theological virtues attributed to him to crumble to the ground" (17).

The imprudence of John XXIII's act may be seen in the [past] refusals of Pius XI and of Pius XII to entertain the idea. Cardinal Billot, consulted by Pius XI, warned of the perils involved in the Modernist climate prevailing. He remarked:

"The resumption of the Council (Vatican I, suspended with the Franco-Prussian war on 18th July 1870,) is desired by the Church's worst enemies, the Modernists, who are preparing to take advantage of the General States of the Church to carry out a revolution, a new '89, the object of their dreams and of their hopes. Needless to say, they will meet with failure, but we will again experience the days of the end of the pontificate of Leo XIII and beginning of that of Pius X. Worse still we will see the annihilation of the happy fruits of the encyclical *Pascendi* which had reduced them to silence."

Numerous other cardinals shared his view and Pius XI abandoned the idea. So did Pius XII after him, the latter limiting himself to a studied condemnation of current errors in his encyclical *Humani Generis*, a summa of the doctrine of the Church upon the problems posed by the modern world.

John XXIII had to be aware of what was happening around him, of the hazards for the faith that could flow from his proposal. But he had his own way of doing things. What are we to think, then, of Roncalli and his 'Council'? Was he the promoter of an anti-Christian sect intent on destroying the Church? Was he a proto-Modernist wanting to translate the ideas of his friend Dom Beauduin into reality? Or was he merely a gravely imprudent bishop who, instead of accepting he was merely a transitional Pope, wanted to leave his legacy in the Church's history? Whatever the case, John XXIII is certainly the principal [cause] of departure from... adherence to the Church's infallible Magisterium which, till his arrival, had prevailed.

His interventions during the preparatory stages of the Council, and thereafter, were decisive for its development. Pontificate and Council interacted, leaning on each other as they headed toward an embrace with the "world".

It was already apparent in Papa Roncalli's Opening Address where [his priorities lay, for] he openly sided with the revisionist current, whose objective was, in liturgical reform, for example, nothing less than demolition of the Roman Rite.

Cardinal Bea wrote on the day preceding John XXIII's election:

"Nothing can be said, at this time, about the reform. The first question is what kind of approach the new Pope will take on the matter. In fact, not all the cardinals were agreed that the reform should be carried out". (18)

A few days earlier, as Pius XII lay dying, Dom Lambert Beauduin, leader of the ecumenical (and liturgical) movement, condemned by Pius XI with his *Mortalium Animos*, had made (to Fr Bouyer, in the abbey of Chevetogne) the remark already quoted:

"If they elect Roncalli all will be saved: he would be capable of convening a Council and consecrating ecumenism... I'm confident, it is our chance. The majority of the cardinals don't know what to do. They might vote for him".

As they did! But with that election the death of the Roman Liturgy was also decided. (19) And not only that...

Instead of the "spring of the Church" and a "new Pentecost" and the "powerful breath of the Holy Spirit"; instead of a dispersing of "the darkness of error", as on Good Friday; instead of a repetition of a "syllabus against the principal errors of our age" - as the best theologians expected - Vatican II was an illusion. The reason is that "a Council of censure" was a contradiction to the approach of Pope John XXIII.

The attempt by the Roman Curia to check and curb his directives proved futile. When given an account of progress on the preparatory work, John XXIII commented "the preparation of the Council will not be the work of the Roman Curia" and, at the Pentecost meeting of 5th June 1960, he made a clear distinction between Curia and Council. (20)

Confronted with the aloofness and resistance of many of the cardinals (only 24 of the 74 expressed 'adhesions' or proposals), John XXIII succeeded in working his way around the Curia, turning instead to the world's bishops. Some 77% of a far from acquiescent episcopate responded.

In any event, he was not interested in their views. All he cared about was the opinion of his great friend, Giovanni Battista Montini, as witness this written to Card Montini on April 4, 1961:

“I should write to all the bishops, archbishops and cardinals of the world. But, in order to reach every one of them, I’m satisfied with writing to the Archbishop of Milan, since, with him, I carry them all in my heart, and to me he represents them all. (21)

Montini, the very man Pius XII had absolutely not wanted to become Pope, was regarded by John XXIII as representing all of the episcopate! (22)

Jean Guitton (Pantheist and Bergsonian), and friend of Montini, wrote:

“Pius XII knew it. He himself said he was the ‘last Pope’, the last link of a long chain. (23)

And yet in those years of the 1950s the Church was thriving. But Pius XII knew an unprecedented crisis was in the making, in the very bosom of the Church as Pius X had noted. That crisis came about with the election of John XXIII. Modernism exploded violently, in spite of what Pius XII had said in *Humani Generis* (1950).

Jacques Maritain was of the same view:

“The modernism of the time of Pius X, compared with the modern neo-modernist fever, was but a mere hay-fever. (24)

In fact, with Pope John XXIII the situation [under Pius X] was reversed. The progressives emerged everywhere. From the Conclave that, on the eleventh ballot, elected him in the afternoon of 28th October 1958, some unofficial news leaked out to give cause for reflection. Can one exclude a Masonic influence? The very name he took, “John XXIII”, according to Freemason, Pier Carpi, would be the esoteric and Rosicrucian name taken in the Lodge. (25)

Whatever the situation, his masonic friend, Baron Marsaudon, wrote—

“For us (freemasons) there was great emotion (on his election as Pope), and for many of our friends it was a sign”. (26)

Of recognition? Here is another fact. Just after his election, John XXIII telephoned Monsignor Montini:

“Excellency, I’m keeping your place warm” (27).

One of his earliest acts was to make Montini a cardinal and to describe his action in this way: “Montini, the first fruit of our pontificate”.

Even on his deathbed, on May 31st, 1963, John XXIII would recommend his beloved Montini:

“I believe it will be Cardinal Montini; upon him should converge the votes of the Holy College”. (28)

John XXIII, therefore, was only the precursor of Pope Paul VI who was to carry out the disastrous revision in the Church which would render Pius XII’s words to the French Ambassador, “Après moi, le deluge!” prophetic. (29)¹ It was the announcement of the “new era” of the Church.

The day following his election, John XXIII produced his first radio-message to the world, *Hac trepida ora*, in which he spoke of the (Communist) persecutions against the Catholic Church, “in open contrast” with “modern civilization” and long acquired “human rights”. (30) He then went on to praise “modern civilization”, with which, as Pius IX had taught, the Pope could never offer compromise or reconciliation. (31) Whatever the case, why praise the “human rights” of the Declaration of 1789? He received, promptly, inevitably, the heartfelt wishes of the Chief Rabbi of

¹ Attributed variously to Louis XV or Madame Pompadour.

Israel, Isaac Herzog, as of the Anglican archbishop, Geoffrey Fischer; of Paul Robinson, president of the federated Churches, and of the Head of the “Russian Orthodox Church”, Patriarch Alexei. The message was a programmatic address in that it conveyed the two principal themes that would mark his pontificate, unity, in the life of the Church, and peace, in the order of the world, (32) where unity meant ‘ecumenism’, and peace, ‘pacifism’ or an opening to the left.

After that John XXIII moved to appoint new cardinals, the first of whom was Monsignor Montini [whom Pius XII had refused the purple habit]. So, here we were, suffering the consequences of John XXIII’s actions. Far from being a Pope of transition, he was a reformist, a real reformer such as the Church had not known since the Counter-Reformation. (33) What did we get in consequence? A “new revised” Church called “Conciliar” (*quod dixit Cardinal Benelli*).

The Pope is omnipotent in the Church so that the neo-modernist revolution, the dream of whose members was to draw a “Pope” to its service, becomes understandable. But it was, also, the dream of the Freemasonry of Nubius and Volpe which [Italian writer] Fogazzaro had expressed in [his novel] “The Saint”. (34) [Their common] dream took shape in John XXIII. Was he not called the “Papa Buono?”

The progressives made him their prophet and the people thought him a “saint”, which facilitated popular acceptance of his religious revolution. From his earliest days he upset rules and laws, customs and century-old traditions. He struck suddenly and violently leaving everybody speechless. The secular broadsheets, in consequence, made him a front-page phenomenon. (35) The world had found a “new Pope”, and a “new Church”. (36)

He underscored, not without a certain mischievousness, his differences with Pius XII, (37) and his admirers would refer to that text in order to substantiate their dreams. (38) His popularity rating with the masses reached its apex with his visit to the *Bambino Gesù* Hospital, and (following day) to the Roman detention centre *Regina Coeli*. Such acts every previous Pope had performed... yet with John XXIII these acts were praised as “innovative”.

The head of the Milanese Modernists, Gallarati Scotti, saw in John XXIII the eponymous “Saint” of Fogazzaro’s novel, a novel St Pius X had seen fit to place on the Index. Scotti wrote to the Pope, “... I implore Your Holiness to step out of the Vatican...” And he did! He engaged in many “walkouts”, without fear or piety, one after another. To visit the ill and the convicts are, to be sure, deeds of mercy, but was that “goodness” (or affability?) on the part of Pope John XXIII, not somewhat exaggerated? He loved, to be sure, the foes of the Church, but much less did he love those disagreeable to him, such as, Fr Mattiussi, Fr Lombardi, and Cardinal Ottaviani, whom he made the object of his rather heavy gibes. Nor did he refrain from indulging himself at the expense of the memory of Pius XII. His relationship with Padre Pio was far from idyllic.

Long before, in 1923, while passing through Foggia as national director of the Pontifical Missionary Works, he was invited to call on San Giovanni Rotondo, but declined. (39) And when, in a long journalistic piece in *Settimana Incom*, it was asserted inter alia that Pope John XXIII had referred to Padre Pio as “a saint”, and that the Capuchin had predicted his election, he instructed his secretary, Monsignor Loris Capovilla:

“Would you please write, privately, on my behalf, to Monsignor Andrea Ceserano, Archbishop of Mafredonia, that what was written on *Incom* about the relationship between Padre Pio and me is utter invention. I have never had any association with him, nor have I met him or written to him, nor has it

ever occurred to me to send him a blessing, nor was I ever asked, directly or indirectly, to do so, either before or after the Conclave, or ever. As soon as Monsignor Dell'Acqua is back, we should see to it that a stop be put to these fabrications, which do no honour to anyone”.

There is more. On July 19th, 1960, Monsignor Maccari met John XXIII, who gave him the assignment of an Apostolic Visitation to *San Giovanni Rotondo* which had been determined on July 13th previous. The Pope followed closely this sad ‘affair’ which ended negatively for Padre Pio (who was even accused of immorality), with disciplinary measures. Shortly before the Visitation there had occurred a sacrilegious recording of confessions conducted by Padre Pio, a recording decided by Monsignor Terenzi, parish priest of the *Divino Amore* [famous Sanctuary of the Blessed Virgin], in Rome, and carried out by some Capuchins under cover of authority from a prelate in the Holy Office.

It was alleged that John XXIII, too, was fixed with guilt over the recording. On November 6th, 1986, Monsignor Capovilla, in a letter to Fr Antonio Cairoli (postulator of the Cause of John XXIII), called that claim “insulting and slanderous”, but then he added—

“when at the end of the (Apostolic) Visit, the Pope asked me whether I had listened to the recordings of the “wiretaps”, I replied I had refused to do so, he confided in me that he had not done so either”.

It is clear, then, that the Pope knew of those sacrilegious recordings (...). He may have refused to listen to them, but that they had made it to his antechamber, may be deduced from Monsignor Maccari’s *Memorial* [to Cardinal Ratzinger in 1990]. (40) Whatever the case, the Pope’s action was one deserving of intervention by the Holy Office. [The only reasonable conclusion is that] John XXIII tolerated the sacrilege... and, in lieu of punishing the offenders, he elected to punish the victim.

Poor Padre Pio! There was no telegram of congratulation from the Vatican on the occasion of his 50 year jubilee, ‘though two other friars received a telegram the same day. He was also denied the faculty of imparting the papal blessing, which Pius XII had granted him twice previously between 1957 and 1958. He was even denied a simple Apostolic blessing, and *L’ Osservatore Romano* was ordered to make no mention of Padre Pio’s 50th anniversary. (41)

Is this the “Pope” they intend to “beatify”?

1 “Addresses, Messages, Interviews of the Holy Father John XXIII. 1958-1963”, 5 vol. Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, p. 258.

2 John XXIII. *Il Giornale dell’anima*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, V edition, Rome 1967, p. 359-447.

3 *Teachings of Paul VI*, Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, Vol. 1, 1963, p. 168.

4 *Teachings of John Paul II*, Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, Vol. IV, 2/1981, p. 752-757.

5 Hebblethwaite, *John XXIII, the Pope of the Council*, Italian Edition, Rusconi 1989, p. 444-447.

6 G. Martina, *The Church in Italy in the Last Thirty Years*, Studium, Rome 1977, p. 85-86.

7 L. Bouyer, *Dom Lambert Beauduin, un homme d’Eglise*, Castermann 1964, p. 180-181, cited by D. Bonnetterre, *Le Mouvement liturgique*, Fideliter 1980, p. 112.

8 Hebblethwaite, cited work, p. 400 and 437. The “Statements” of Card. Ottaviani are found on *Epoca* magazine of 8 February 1968. The American diplomat Bernard R. Bonnot quotes them in his book: *Pope John XXIII, an Astute Pastoral Leader*, Alba House, New York 1979, p. 13.

- 9 Hebblethwaite, cited work, 432, 434, 435, 436, 440, FF1. Also: Capovilla *How did the Vatican II Council Come About* in: A. A. V. V. Massimo, Milan, 1988, p. 35-37.
- 10 Hebblethwaite, cited work, p. 435.
- 11 G. Martina, cited work, p. 86.
- 12 Wilton Wynn, *Custodians of the Kingdom*, Frassinelli 1989, p. 81. 23
- 13 *Addresses, Messages, Interviews of the Holy Father John XXIII*, Tip. Poliglotta Vaticana 1960-1967, vol. 1, p. 129-133.
- 14 Hebblethwaite, cited work, p. 453. Giancarlo Zizola in *The Utopia of Pope John XXIII*, reproduces the original text of the address, Citadella editrice, Assisi 1975, p. 322; the official text, instead, ref. Giovanni Caprile SJ, *The Vatican II Council*, Ed. Civiltà Cattolica, Rome, vol. 1, part 1, p. 50.
- 15 Hebblethwaite, cited work, p. 454 and 453 - ref. also Caprile, *The Vatican II Council*, ed. Civiltà Cattolica, Rome, vol. 1, p. 51.
- 16 Hebblethwaite, cited work, p. 455-456.
- 17 Benny Lai, *The Non-Elected Pope*, Giuseppe Siri, *Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church*, Laterza edizioni, Rome-Bari 1993, p. 179.
- 18 Stepan Schmidt, *Agostino Bea, the Cardinal of Unity*, p. 231.
- 19 L. Bouyer, *Dom Lambert Beauduin, un Homme d'Eglise*, Castermann, 1964, p. 180-181, cited by the Abbé Didier Bonnetterre, *Le Mouvement liturgique*, Fideliter, 1980, p. 112.
- 20 Giovanni Caprile, *Vatican II Council. Announcement and Preparation*, 1/1, Rome 1959-60, p. 192.
- 21 Hebblethwaite, *John XXIII. The Pope of the Council*, p. 485-486.
- 22 Benny Lai, *The Non-Elected Pope...*, Laterza, Rome-Bari, 1993, p. 100, note 18, to be compared with p. 95, note 6.
- 23 *Trenti Giorni*, year X, n. 11, November 1992, p. 70.
- 24 Jacques Maritain, *Le Paysan de la Garonne*, Lesclée, Paris 1966, p. 16-19.
- 25 It is well known what abuses Freemasonry makes of the name and cult of the two St. Johns: the Baptist and the Evangelist. Roncalli justified his choice by saying that John was the name of his father and of the Patron Saint of Sotto il Monte [his native village]. On the other hand, there are those maintaining that the name of John XXIII replicated that of the anti-Pope Baldassarre Cossa, who summoned the Council of Costanza which then deposed him.
- 26 Yves Marsaudon, *L'Oecumenisme vu par un Franc-maçon de tradition*, ed. Vatan, Paris 1964, p. 47.
- 27 It appears in *Trenti Giorni* (n. 5, May 1992, p. 54). It is a statement of Silvio Cardinal Oddi, confided to him by John XXIII himself. It must be noted that the magazine quotes the statement in an article dedicated to sectarian interferences in the Council.
- 28 Hebblethwaite, cited work, p. 385.
- 29 Hebblethwaite, cited work, p. 385.
- 30 *Encyclicals and Addresses of H.H. John XXIII*, Edizioni Paoline, Rome 1964, vol. 1, p. 12.
- 31 Pius IX, *Syllabus*, prop. 70, DS. 2970.
- 32 Hebblethwaite, *John XXIII, the Pope of the Council*, p. 413-414.
- 33 Wilton Wynn, *Custodians of the Kingdom*, Frassinelli 1989, p. 22.
- 34 Jacques Cretineau-Joly, *L'Eglise Romane en face de la Révolution*, integral re-edition of 1859, care of the Cercle de la Renaissance Française, Paris 1976; also Monsignor Henry Delassus, *The Problem of the Present Hour* anastatic reprint of the 1907 edition, Edizioni Cristianità, Piacenza 1977, vol. 1, p. 291 and subsequent.
- 35 Renzo Allegri, *The Pope Who Changed the World*, Reverdito editore, Gardolo di Trento 1988, p. 171 e 185.

- 36 Antonio Spinosa, *Pius XII. The Last Pope*, Mondadori 1992, p. 375.
 37 Hebblethwaite, cited work, p. 417.
 38 Hans Kung, *Infallible?* p. 281-289, Ateneo, Bologna 1970, entire last chapter [entitled]: "How Could the Pope Be?"
 39 Monsignor Carlo Maccari, *Memorial to Cardinal Ratzinger*, 27th November 1990. Ref. also *L'Europeo*, n. 1-2, 3 e 10 January 1992, p. 64.
 40 *L'Europeo*, n. 1-2, 3, 10 January 1992, p. 66.
 41 Pagnossin, *The Calvary of Padre Pio*, vol. 2, p. 94.

The Holy Office, as it is widely known, came into being in 1542 against Luther and lasted up until 1964 when Montini suppressed it. John XXIII held the Holy Office along with the rest of the Roman Curia in little esteem. Cardinal Suenens reported this witticism of John XXIII:

"The Holy Office is doing what it can in order to pin down heresies in my writings and in my projects... but it has yet to succeed". (1)

Such ill-disguised hostility was driven by numerous motives, his personal disposition replete with liberal and modernizing ideas and his experiences when younger... Cardinal De Lai had offered him healthy advice but [Roncalli] regarded it as irritating. His personal secretary Monsignor Capovilla affirmed that Roncalli felt repulsion for Pius X's anti-modernist policy. (2) Indro Montanelli, in articles in *Corriere della sera*, reported an interview with John XXIII, who told him:

"Monsignor Radini-Tedeschi utterly disliked the Roman Curia, so much so that he had once asked [Roncalli], who had never set foot in Rome, to deliver the fruits of I don't know what subscription to the Holy Pope. 'The Holy Pope?', I interposed. 'Saint my foot!' he said and jumped up in anger. I was flabbergasted. Then I put in... 'I didn't made him a saint, you did!' Perhaps, the Pope was grateful for my third-rate witticism, which automatically played down his own. He laughed, and, patting my arm with his hand, he rejoined, 'Why, everybody knows he was a Saint, but a somewhat unusual saint, for he was a sad man. The saints are not supposed to be sad: they have God.'"

These go to explain the grudge John XXIII bore against the Holy Office over the dossiers it maintained on him and which moved him to rehabilitate 'the victims' (3) attacking their 'persecutors', and attempting to ditch all institutions fighting Modernism, starting with the Holy Office.

At first, obviously, the clash could not be frontal. John XXIII proceeded to use the policy of the "two tracks" with the Holy Office, with the Pontifical Biblical Institute and with the Roman Curia. He... went so far as to deny any further audience to Cardinal Ottaviani and worked for the nullification of his office as Cardinal. (4) [This was completed by] Paul VI, it was, who saw to the suppression of the Holy Office and removal of the authority of the old bishop by precluding any influence at a Conclave of all Cardinals over 80 years. So was the *Palazzaccio* ['the evil palace'] defeated.

Once the 'police' were suppressed, however, the spiritual thieves and assassins had free rein to run throughout the Church. There was good reason for labelling Roncalli's pontificate as one of "transition", that is, fracture of the old equilibrium in favour of the new. But... John XXIII failed to reckon with the corrosive power of the ferments among the clergy under the massive propaganda of the International Left. All the weak spirits, the defenders of the "world", the

“progressive priests”, the Catholics captivated by the *Lapiriani*², the tight-rope walkers and the so-called advanced elites, were swallowed up in that black hole.

Your Excellency will recall that Cardinal Tardini, John XXIII’s Secretary of State, had said that the idea of the Council made him consider John XXIII “temporarily mad”. Well acquainted as he was with the Church and the world, ferments among the clergy and dangerous oscillations in various foreign episcopates, in short, in a time so unstable and tumultuous in the world’s history, Tardini along with many in and without the Curia, thought that a Council should not have been convened. Dangerous it was! Dangerous it proved to be.

From the Council’s very first Session polemics shook the “ecumenical bridge” with yearnings for “sociological modernism” rendering it unstable under the thrust of opposing tendencies. [There were] anti-conformist wretches, backed up or tolerated by prelates; a surfacing of the “democratic Church” that wanted to be accommodating, pacifist, ready to deal with the traditional enemies, granting ample breath and drive to neo-Modernism, and even Communism which, meanwhile, cloaked itself with a false understanding of the ‘rights of religion’, using the method of “distension” toward the Church.

This new climate was recognized and approved by Moscow! The Soviet magazine *Nauka i Religia*, under the signature of Anatoli Krassikov commented, on 14th August 1963,

“The Ecumenical Council, resuming its works on September 29th, has already shown that in the ecclesiastical hierarchies there exists a strong tendency which rejects Pius XII’s old methods”.

The magazine gave credit to John XXIII for being—

“a wise and far-sighted politician who realistically perceived the changes taking place in the world and knew how to take into due consideration the imperatives of the time...”

The objectives of international Marxism were thus revealed.

I would have Your Excellency recall with what benevolence Pope John XXIII received Adjubei, one of the “new barbarians”, the Communists, which he fancied he could bring into [the fold] along the lines of the imperious [direction to a pagan] of St. Remigius—

“Sigambrian, henceforward burn what thou hast worshipped, and worship what thou hast burned”.

Instead, shortly after on 12th September 1963, Adjubei pronounced blasphemous declarations against Catholicism at the microphones of Radio Moscow. Yet John XXIII continued to believe he could win them over through goodness.

Pacem in Terris became the “sound track” for Marxist propaganda. The Communists printed millions of copies of chapter V containing the norms for political alliances, to distribute them in all the nations. That encyclical would shatter the last [of the obstacles]... separating Christianity from Communism, creating the great misunderstanding that would undermine the foundations of the Church, inviting her, explicitly, to the encounter, to dialogue, to ‘acceptance’. Seventeen days after its promulgation, on May 1st, 1963, elections took place in Italy and the response, unequivocal, to *Pacem in Terris*, was an increase in the vote for the Italian Communist Party (PCI) by upwards of a million votes [relative to the vote five years earlier]. Over one million votes were presented with a blessing to the representatives of official atheism. When the results became

² From Giorgio La Pira, Catholic mayor of Florence in the 1950s and early 1960s, nicknamed the “White Communist” as he sided with the predominantly socialist and communist working class of the time.

clear, an excited throng of Communists packed St. Peter's square, shouting 'long live John XXIII', 'long live the Pope of peace'. From that day John XXIII was like a marionette in their hands. ...

He was, by now worn out. Physicians informed him he had no more than a year to live, a 'death sentence' that... made his blood run cold. Those around him saw him weeping at times. The Communist throng had him in thrall. Just twenty-five days before his death he was 'presented' with the 'Balzan Prize' for peace – that turbid propagandistic invention of the left. He intended to decline but found himself, literally, dragged from his bed, dressed in the papal regalia and hoisted into the Sistine Chapel – given his dreadful conditions, it proved impossible to carry him into St. Peter's. Pale, distraught, his lifeless eyes fastened on emptiness, he was placed on the throne where for long he quivered, shaken by shivers. But others were there to smile, the representatives of that 'award' put together with moneys of those slain under 'the reds' in 1945. And there was his Secretary, Monsignor Capovilla, with his large funereal shades, smiling continuously at the paparazzi.

After the return to his apartment, John XXIII refused any other visit.

On the eve of his death he had, I am certain, a sort of conversion. Some heard his voice moan in despair over what he had done. Before breathing his last, he spelled out, word after word, the Profession of Faith to the Catholic religion, whispering, "I'm dying, sacrificed like the Lamb". Why? To whom was he alluding? Outside, the rotary presses of the Italian Communist party worked relentlessly, day and night, to distribute to the masses, tons of printed-paper upon their "Pope", the "Pope of the Marxists". Not even on the death of Stalin was so much achieved.

That, in summary, is the opening the 'Papa Buono' gave to the left – certainly not a Good Pope.

Marxism's offer of the olive branch has led us to the sunset of this millennium and the dawn of the next. Who can say whether the new one will reveal humanity as Christian, or desolately Marxist.

John XXIII's legacy will be much more burdensome than may be thought. His favouring of the left was to be repeated by Monsignor Montini, principal advocate of ideological coexistence with socialism achieved through a one-sided 'religious softening'. Montini built on John XXIII's indulgence of *Le Sillon* (the Furrow), directed by Marc Sangnier, condemned by St. Pius X on 25th August 1910 in his Letter *Notre Charge Apostolique* [in these terms]:

"Every member of the Sillon... works but for one sect, the Sillon, whose eyes are fixed on a chimera, it brings Socialism in its train... "[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... and which, under the pretext of freedom and human dignity, would bring back to the world... the reign of legalized cunning and force."

On Marc Sangnier's death Roncalli, while Nuncio, had written to his widow:

"Dear Madam, I first spoke of Marc Sangnier in Rome, toward 1903 or 1904, at a gathering of the Catholic Youth. The powerful appeal of his word, of his soul, had captivated me, and I hold of his person and of his political and social activity the most vivid memory of my priestly youth. His noble and great humbleness in accepting, in 1910, the admonition, in fact very affectionate and benevolent (sic!) of the holy Pope Pius X, gives my eyes the measure of true greatness. Souls able to remain so

faithful and respectful, such as his was, to the Gospel and to the Holy Church, are made for the highest ascents, which grant glory down here with our contemporaries as well as with our posterity, to whom Marc Sangnier's example will remain as a teaching and encouragement. On the occasion of his passing, my spirit was much comforted in observing that the most representative voices of official France were unanimously agreed in wrapping Marc Sangnier, as a mantle of honour, with the Sermon on the Mount. No loftier homage and praise could be rendered to the memory of this distinguished Frenchman, of whom his contemporaries could appreciate the clearness of a deeply Christian soul as well as the noble sincerity of heart". (5)

Had Monsignor Roncalli [forgotten] that, as far as the Catholic Church was concerned, the Sillon was nothing but "a miserable affluent of the great movement of apostasy"?

Nor must it be forgotten that, on June 5th, 1960, John XXIII had approved, with the institution of the Secretariat the [very] 'ecumenical movement' Pius XI had condemned. This 'ecumenical movement' had come into being toward the close of the previous century as a Protestant creation driven by Protestants' concern over the continuous fragmentation of their religious world. The 'Orthodox' schismatic sects got involved in the ill-famed 'Ecumenical Council of Churches' (ECC) set up in Amsterdam in 1948 by [a group of] 147 Christian 'churches' (!!).

The Catholic Church had always prohibited Catholic participation. Three Decrees of the Holy Office—of 5th June 1948, and 4th July and 20th December 1949—vetoed the involvement of anyone without previous authorization from the Holy See. Prior to this Pius XI's *Mortalium Animos* (6th January 1928) had condemned that 'ecumenical movement', denominating it 'pan Christian'. (6) Yet in the Consistory of 14th December 1959 John XXIII elevated to Cardinal the Jesuit Fr Augustin Bea "without whom John XXIII would probably not have got the Council that he wanted". (7) He then altered the *Commission for the Promotion of the Unity of the Christians* into a Secretariat, since, as he told Cardinal Bea—

"Commissions have their own tradition; let us call the new organization 'Secretariat', so you are not bound by any tradition; you are going to enjoy a higher freedom". (8)

The [Secretariat] promptly embarked on 'historical meetings' with representatives of the various religions. On June 13th, 1960, John XXIII initiated a dialogue with Judaism when he received, secretly, Jules Marx Isaac³. On December 2nd he met the Anglican Primate, opening a dialogue with Protestantism and giving way to other such initiatives [which included] making it possible for non-Catholics to attend the Council as "observers" or "guests" thus facilitating their influence on its ruminations.

A raft of heretics followed Fisher's visit, crowding the private study of the Pope, including—

- 12th June 1961, Bernard Pawley, 'canon' of the cathedral of Ely, personal representative of the 'archbishops' of Canterbury and York;
- 15th November 1961, Dr. Arthur Lichtenberger, president of the Episcopalian Church of the United States of America;
- 20th December 1961, Dr. Joseph Batist, president of the US "National Baptist Convention";
- 28th March 1962, the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, Presbyterian;
- 7th April 1962, Dr. Mervyn Stockwood, Anglican bishop of Southwark;
- 27th April 1962, Professor Edmund Schlink DD, of the University of Heidelberg, Germany, representative of the local Council of the Evangelical Church;

³ Well known Jewish historian who died in 1963.

- 10th May 1962, Dr. Arthur Morris, Anglican bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich;
- 17th May 1962, the Metropolitan Damaskinos of Voplos, Greece;
- 20th June 1962, Dr. Joost de Blank, Anglican archbishop of Cape Town, South Africa;
- 18th January 1960, the Masons of the Judaic-Masonic lodge of the B'nai B'rith;
- 30th July 1962, Shizuka Matsubara, superior of the Shintoist temple at Kyoto, Japan, with his family,

and so on. All of these, more or less secret, meetings triggered a sort of 'ecumenical' fever which made the star of Cardinal Bea to shine. Their chief effect was to bury Pius XI's encyclical *Mortalium Animos...* Bea had, by now, triumphed in spreading the new 'ecumenical' doctrine.

The Church's ecclesiology had previously excluded involvement of Catholics with separated Christians. With Pope John XXIII, non-Catholics were to be encompassed within the Church, as he clearly conveyed to the Preparatory Commission on November 13th, 1960—

“... [the] great point, to be kept firm by any baptized person, [is] that the Church always remains His (Christ's) mystical Body, of whom He remains the Head, and to Whom every one of us is referred, and to Whom we belong”,

Here he got around Pius XII's *Mystici Corporis* reducing it to a mere historical document of the year 1943.

By now Papa Roncalli's 'ecumenism' was beyond denial. Guido Gusso, the personal attendant of the former Patriarch of Venice declared in an interview with Renato Allegri,

“When I realized that the Cardinal invited Protestants, Jews and Muslims without distinction to 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 own 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’”. (9)

Here, too, Monsignor Roncalli was ignoring what the Apostle St. John had said:

“If any man come to you and bring not this teaching, receive him not into your house nor bid him God speed, for he who says God speed you participates in his wicked works” (2 John 10, 11).

Hence, one could say Roncalli professed religious indifferentism, which is heresy, and liable to cause simple souls to lose their faith. He thought a Muslim as agreeable to God as a Christian. Thus he effectively endorsed the “anonymous Christianity” of the Jesuit, Karl Rahner, who maintained “even one who did not believe in Christ, would be ‘Christian’ all the same”.

At Venice's City Hall, at his first meeting with the City Council, Cardinal Roncalli had said,

“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 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”. (10)

Pure theological nonsense! According to Roncalli, a Christian is one who does “good deeds”, even though he does not believe; and he who is not good, even though baptized and believer, is not a Christian.

Christianity is reduced to pure natural ethics, good deeds equivalent to supernatural ones, and faith becomes superfluous. Here you have his 'ecumenism'. His “Secretariat”, with Bea at the helm produced, after just two years of operation, *inter alia* a scheme which contradicts the

doctrine of the Church and put it before the Council for approval. That under his responsibility before God and His Church was Pope John XXIII.

- 1 Léon Joseph Suenens, "Memories and Hopes", Edizioni Paoline, 1993.
- 2 A. Melloni, in AA.VV. "Pope John", G. Alberigo, Laterza Edizioni, Bari, 1987, p. 31.
- 3 Roncalli's letter sent on 13 January 1959, to don Angelo Pedrinelli, parish priest of Carvico, who, like him, had been professor at the Bergamo's seminary, and removed from post by Monsignor Rafini on account of his modernism - (See: Hebblethwaite, cited work, p. 464). Roncalli rehabilitated the Modernist hagiographer, Monsignor Lanzoni. Also known were his relations, even epistolary, with Gallarati Scotti, leader of Lombard modernism. His introduction of a trial for beatification of Cardinal Ferrari (10 February 1963) was an attempt to "de-canonize" St. Pius X, who had chastised Ferrari over the modernism that characterised his pastoral conduct. (*L'Osservatore Romano*, 23rd May 1984).
- 4 A. Riccardi, cited work, p. 151 and note 63 on p. 171. 32
- 5 *Itinéraires*, November 1980, pp. 152-153, quoting from: E. Pezet *Chétiens au service de la Cité*, de Léon XIII au Sillon et au MRP-Ed. NEL 1965, and from the magazine *L'âme Populaire*, year 60, n. 571, September 1980.
- 6 The term "pan-Christian" is attributed to the Valdese pastor Ugo Janni, director of the ecumenical magazine "Fede e vita" (Faith and Life).
- 7 Peter Hebblethwaite, "John XXIII. The Pope of the Council", Rusconi Edizioni, Milan, 1989, p. 529.
- 8 S. Schidt, "Agostino Bea. The Cardinal of Unity", Città Nuova Editrice, Rome 1987, p. 348.
- 9 R. Allergri, "The Pope Who Changed the World", Reverdito editore 1988, p. 120.
- 10 Hebblethwaite, "John XXIII", 2nd edition, Italian, Mursia, Milan, p. 345.

IN REALITY, THEN, WHO WAS POPE JOHN XXIII?

One cannot ignore here the alleged initiation of Monsignor Roncalli to the secret Masonic society of the "Rose Cross", an initiation that would have taken place during his time in Turkey. All we have is the written text of Pier Carpi, a Mason known for his biography of Cagliostro (Meb Publishers) and an inquiry into the Merchants of the occult (Armenia publishers). The author of those "Prophecies of Pope John", Pier Carpi maintains that, in 1935, while Apostolic Delegate in Turkey, Roncalli was initiated to a secret Society he abstains from naming but whose initiation ceremony he describes (p. 53 et seq.), which appears in the Templarist Freemasonry rite mentioned by Le Forestier.

During the ceremony [it is alleged] Roncalli took the name 'Johannes', the name he would take as Pontiff. Carpi's source was an aged member of the Rose Cross (p. 35). He also reports a session Roncalli attended a few weeks after at a temple of the Order. There are also, as we will see, other more serious arguments corroborating collusion between Roncalli and Freemasonry.

The Grand Master of the Grand Orient of Italy, Virgilio Gaito, in two interviews with a reporter of *L'Italia Settimanale* and one of *Trenta Giorni*, the monthly of the "Comunione e Liberazione" association, to the question: "Do you know if there are any priests in the lodges of the Grand Orient; the buzz has it that some cardinal had been a brother..." he replied,

“Probably. I have no information. They say John XXIII was initiated... when he was Nuncio in Paris. That is what I was told. Besides, in his messages I caught many aspects that are in fact Masonic. I was pleased to hear him say one must place the accent upon man”. (3)

And to the journalist Cubeddu, of *Trenta Giorni*, he [Grand Master Gaito] said, “It seems Pope John XXIII was initiated in Paris, and participated in the works of the Workshops at Istanbul...” The Grand Commendatore of the Supreme Council of Mexican Freemasonry, Carlos Vasquez Rangel, also asserted “Angelo Roncalli was supposedly initiated to Freemasonry in Paris”. (4)

These assertions of Masonic Grand Masters render the affiliation of John XXIII to Freemasonry most probable. The Freemason Pier Carpi agrees that John XXIII joined the Rose Cross in 1935, at Istanbul. But it was in Paris – according to Gaito and Vasquez Rangel – that Monsignor Roncalli would have been initiated to the secrets of the “Children of the Widow”.

Here, again, we recall his friendship with the socialist Vincent Auriol and with the radical Edouard Herriot, Freemasons both. (5) I also recall his disappointment [sic] when they told him his above praised friend Minister of Education of the French Government, whom he considered “very good”, was a Mason. (6) One further indication was his friendship with the Baron Yves Marie Antoine Marsaudon of the Grand Lodge of France and, from 1932, Venerable Master of the 33d degree of the “Republic” Lodge”. (7) Marsaudon confirms it in his three books. (8) He wrote:

“On numerous occasions... in the stillness of his study, we were able to have with the Nuncio more and more lively discussions even about our humble conceptions as regards the relationship between Church and Freemasonry... at last, we came to discuss the rapprochement between the different Christian Churches... We were able to touch upon very delicate issues regarding some Roman disciplines (which?), and even dogma... and ‘those he perceived in the air’ (?) as, for example, on the Marian dogma of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin to Heaven.”

To Marsaudon’s query, ‘Your Excellency, what do you think of the voices about the promulgation of the new Marian dogma?’ Monsignor Roncalli replied,

“What do we read in the Gospel? The Mother of Jesus is scarcely considered and not always well treated by Her Son. Keep in mind: ‘Who is my Mother or my Brothers?’ And He looked around in a circle at those who sat about him, and said, ‘Here are my Mother and my Brothers, for whoever does the will of God is My Brother and My Sister and Mother...’ and a harsh answer at the Marriage of Cana, “What have I to do with thee?... Then, she is the sorrowful Mother, but very human, at the foot of the Cross”. Suddenly, but as widely expected in Rome, the dogma of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary was promulgated by Pius XII”. (9)

Marsaudon goes on to explain this sense of Roncalli’s, saying that he [Roncalli] had a “great caution (?) when confronted with any dogmatic innovation. He always had... in mind... the effect this or that innovation might have produced on the separated Christians”. According to Marsaudon, then, Monsignor Roncalli was opposed, ‘for ecumenical reasons’, to the definition of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Such interpretation is corroborated by another, analogous, incident. After becoming Patriarch of Venice, Monsignor Roncalli, with a letter [dated] 1954 in which he adduced the same ‘ecumenical’ reasons against the Assumption, refused to endorse a petition to institute the holiday of *Mary Regina Mundi*. (10)

In Rome, as in Venice, the relationship between Marsaudon and Roncalli continued; Marsaudon was received “with the utmost graciousness”. (11) It must be noted that, as a Nuncio in Paris, Roncalli had received Marsaudon on numerous occasions at the Nunciature, and on various occasions called on him at his home at Bellevue, Seine-et-Oise. When Marsaudon was appointed Minister of the Order of Malta, he manifested to the Nuncio his perplexity as to whether he

should accept the office on account of his Masonic affiliation, but the Nuncio advised him to accept, while retaining his affiliation to Freemasonry.

As Pope, receiving him at Castel Gandolfo, he encouraged him in his conciliative actions between the churches, as well as between the Church and Freemasonry. Another friend, at the time of his Nunciature, was Carl J. Burckardt, Masonic dignitary and Swiss diplomat, who wrote of Roncalli, "He is a deist and a rationalist... He will change many things. After him, the Church will never be the same". (12)

Mention must be made here, too, of Pius XII's action in placing the Order of Malta under investigation, nominating a Commission of Cardinals for the purpose of informing him of its status with a view to its suppression because of infiltration with Freemasonry. There were very serious doubts as to its residual catholicity. (13) But on June 24, 1961, the feast of St. John Baptist, the Order's patron, John XXIII received at the Vatican the Knights of the Order. In the course of their attendance he disclosed his Brief suppressing the Commission appointed by his predecessor and approving the Order's new constitutions which authorized it again to elect a Grand Master, something Pius XII had prohibited. This action cleared the way for renewed Masonic infiltration of the Order.

Roncalli's attitude towards Freemasonry was invariable. He never condemned it. (14)

After numerous Church documents condemning, and excommunicating, those affiliated with Freemasonry, the last papal voice raised against the infamous sect was that of Pius XII, on May 23rd, 1958, a few months prior to his passing. Thereafter, no more condemnations! Instead, there appeared first, a host of conciliatory documents from episcopal conferences then, documents of the Holy See, culminating in lifting of the penalty of excommunication (on 28th November 1983). Then, unprecedentedly, the Jesuit Fr Michel Riquet, "with the concurrence of the ecclesiastical authorities", held a conference in the Volney Lodge of Laval, France, in which he told of the dialogue, by now in full swing, between the Church and Freemasonry. Thus, with John XXIII, did the Catholic Church throw her doors open to the cult.

The Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of France, Dupey, declared—

"John XXIII and Vatican II gave a formidable impulse to the work of clarification and reciprocal disarmament between Church and Freemasonry."

The writer Léon de Poncins declared—

"With the election of John XXIII, one had clearly the impression of a methodically organized international campaign." (15)

The Grand Master of [Italian] Freemasonry, Salvini, declared, in 1970, "

"John XXIII has recently published a document, which on this theme stands so close to our approach (i.e., not asking the brothers about their religion). In fact, *Mater et Magistra* and *Pacem in Terris* offer interesting starting points for human rapprochement, even where ideological differences exist." (16)

Subsequently, Alec Mellor wrote—

"The last phase had to be prepared through the Revision wanted by John XXIII and, subsequently, by Paul VI. (17)

And Roberto Fabiani—

"It was John XXIII to break the ice with a measure that went completely unnoticed: he authorized Protestants, converted to Catholicism and affiliated with Freemasonry, to retain their Masonic membership. From that moment the contacts grew unchecked." (18)

Jesuit Fr José Antonio Ferrer Benimelli confirms Roncalli's position in regard to the double membership. Not only did John XXIII not oppose Freemasonry, he favoured it and espoused, in part, its principles supporting the possibility of being at once Catholic and a Freemason. It is appropriate, then, to affirm the current 'ecumenism' as legitimate heir of Freemasonry whose aim it is to unite all religious confessions [i.e., religious syncretism].

This, then, the revolution pursued by John XXIII is the revolution of 'freedom of conscience'. His tolerance for Freemasonry which looks to the abolition of all dogmas, had as its end abolition of the dogmatic Church of Rome. How else is one to read John XXIII's first clamorous gesture of welcoming, on December 2nd, 1960, in the Vatican the Masonic Anglican Primate, Geoffrey F. Fischer, 'Archbishop' of Canterbury, than as a first initiative in the matter of 'ecumenism'?

Fischer had been initiated into the "Old Reptonian" Lodge, n. 3725, of the Grand Lodge of England, in 1916. By 1939 in this 'Grand Mother Lodge of the world', he held the position of Grand Chaplain, which in the Latin-Catholic Freemasonry lodges goes by the name of "Grand Orator" (19). Fisher *initiated* the "Rome-London dialogue".

The encounter of two Popes and two Masonic Chiefs (John XXIII and Fisher; Paul VI and Athenagoras) (20) is quite astounding.

The initiation of Anglican hierarchies to Freemasonry is a common occurrence (21).

At this point, one has to ask oneself, what kind of relationship Pope John XXIII entertained with the Jews, advocates [as they are] of all kinds of attacks on the Catholic Church intending to demolish her? Here is a quick synthesis of that relationship.

In March of 1950, in Algiers, Monsignor Roncalli "spoke of the Jews as of the sons of the promise (Romans ix: 8)", as providing a basis for a serious theological dialogue and the consideration of the people of Israel "in the light of Abraham, the great Patriarch of all believers". (22) This conveniently overlooked the reality that, today, Jews are no longer believers but incredulous, and that they are no longer the "heirs of the Promise".

For Roncalli, on the contrary, they would be part of the Mystic Body of Christ (even though they do not believe), that is, of the Church. In Paris, as he watched a film showing the horrors of Buchenwald and Auschwitz, he cried, "Why? The Mystic Body of Christ!". [But] the Mystic Body of Christ coincides (only) with the Catholic Church.

It is important to recall that the Jew, Jules Marx Isaac, received from John XXIII the promise of a revision of the Christian doctrine as regards the relationship between Church and Judaism. On January 18th, 1960, at the "World Jewish Congress", and on October 17th in the same year at the American "United Jewish Appeal" Association, (23) John XXIII presented Allocutions. In the second of these the Pope uttered doctrinal errors. On March 17th, 1962, as his car advanced on the *Lungotevere* [traffic lane flanking each bank of the Tiber], he had his car stopped near the Synagogue whence a group of Jews was emerging and proceeded to bless them. No previous Pope had ever done such a thing. (24)

He purported to suppress, in the Church's baptismal rite, the formulas referring to Judaic incredulity and Jewish superstition! (25) Moreover, in a secret letter written to the Superior of Wilen Abbey (Innsbruck) he suppressed the cult of Blessed Andrea da Rinn in Tyrol allegedly martyred by Jews in 1462; this, notwithstanding that Pope Benedict XIV had in 1755 in the bull *Beatus Andrea*, pronounced da Rinn's beatification.⁴

In 1960 John XXIII suppressed the veneration of frescoes in the city of Deggendorf, Bavaria, which featured the alleged profanation of consecrated hosts by Jews which had led to their massacre by the Catholic populace. He suppressed, as well, a pilgrimage associated with the frescoes. (26) On October 17th of the same year he received in audience 130 American Jews and their rabbi, Herbert Friedman. He said:

"There is surely a difference between those who acknowledge but the Old Testament and those who add to it the New, in which they see their law and their supreme guide. Such difference, however, does not abolish the fraternity of our common root. We are all children of one and the same Father. We come from the Father and to the Father we must return". (27)

These words of John XXIII are extremely grave! First, because [of their contention that] the difference between Christians and Jews consists in the Jews' endorsement of the Old Testament, This ignores the fact that to the content of the Old Testament the Jews add their Talmud and accord the latter precedence over the Law of God. (28)

Secondly, the 'difference', to which he adverts, is but a *material* difference, which takes no account of the formal differences between Catholic and non-Catholic which exclude a radical unity of destiny and ability to attain the same end, union with God, in the absence of belief in the name of Jesus Christ. [John 1: 12] Accordingly, his invocation 'We come from the Father; to the Father we must return', is not only gratuitous but heterodox and rootedly erroneous.⁵ Moreover, as he went on to state when addressing the Roman Curia on the meeting at Assisi, on December 22nd, 1960, his approach would extend to members of all religions!

It is true *in an improper sense* that we are all children of the same celestial Father - inasmuch as we are creatures of God – but it is not true *in a proper sense*. For faith in God the Father cannot subsist without faith in God the Son.

"If God were your Father, you would indeed love me. For from God I came... You are of your father, the devil, and you want to do the desires of your father... He who is of God hears the words of God. Therefore you hear them not, because you are not of God" [John 8: 42, 44, 47]. (29)

How is one to accept the Pope's statement about the Jews when he was well aware that the Jews reject Christ and His divinity?

But Roncalli's mind, by now, had for decades been prey of a false ecumenism which extended even to Judaism, which would [lead to the confusions of] Vatican II's *Nostra Aetate*.

Here are two Homilies of John XXIII's which demonstrate his attitude of universal brotherhood. At the outbreak of World War II, in Istanbul's Cathedral, he offered this prayer:

⁴ Ed. The cultus in this matter is attended with great difficulties. The child was but two, or three, years old at the time of his murder and incapable, therefore, of forming the requisite act of will of a martyr. Benedict XIV approved beatification on the basis of popular veneration but declined, in 1755, to allow the cause to proceed to canonisation.

⁵ Ed. The Jews, like Mohammedans, do not regard God as their Father.

“We look to You O Lord on behalf of all those living under this heaven, of any race, as we are all brothers, without distinction of religion, law, customs, traditions or class”.

At Pentecost in 1944, in his farewell homily shortly before he left Istanbul, Roncalli embraced with his gaze the composite and variegated assembly packing the Cathedral, and said:

“We can all find the best reasons to underscore the differences of race, culture, religion or conduct among us. Catholics, in particular, are keen to distinguish themselves from others, from the Orthodox, from Protestants, Jews, Muslims, believers of other religions and non-believers... Dear brothers and sons, I have to tell you that, in the light of the Gospel and 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”. (30)

Did Christ come “to knock down the barriers”? Yes, but Christ did it by destroying and condemning other religions and converting their followers to His own. Roncalli speaks, in contrast, of confessional barriers to be overcome by love. No mention of faith—for he speaks of different “faiths” (and “non faiths”) which would unite all men to Christ, first brother, and to the Father. This is the arguing of one ignorant in theology, which teaches that to be adoptive children of the Father and brothers of Jesus Christ one needs both faith and Sanctifying Grace. Now a non-believer possesses neither.

And that applies to the members of other religions with the exception of invincible ignorance whose cases are known only to God and cannot, therefore, be presumed. John XXIII speaks like a visionary, an utopist. What he describes is not the Catholic fraternity but a Masonic one that makes no distinction between religions. Hence, John XXIII was also responsible for the entire action of his close collaborator, Cardinal Bea, toward a radical change in on the Church regarding Judaism, since it was he who decided to break away from ecclesiastical tradition.

It will suffice to recall that it was Roncalli who decided there should be a ‘Secretariat’ to advance the schema on religious freedom (which became *Dignitatis Humanae*) and the one that dealt with the Jews (*Nostra Aetate*). These were certainly inspired and requested by the Masonic lodges B'nai B'rith.

Cardinal Bea, in his report on the schema *De Judaeis*, mentions the Pope’s explicit charge to the Secretariat to address the many prejudices (!) even amongst the Catholics, regarding the Jews, especially those of ‘deicide’ and ‘cursed by God’. Cardinal Bea was able to circumvent every opposition to his schema with a note devoid of any Vatican heading, dated 13th December 1963, written entirely [in the Pope’s] own hand and signed, in which he said,

“Having read with much attention this report of Cardinal Bea’s, we are in perfect agreement as to its gravity and the responsibility of Our consideration. The utterance *sanguis ejus super nos et super filios nostros*⁶ does not pre-empt solution of the problem or impede the apostolate for salvation of all the children of Abraham, or of any others living on the earth. *Te, ergo, quesumus Tuis famulis subveni, quos praetioso sanguine redemisti!*⁷ – Joannes XXIII. (31)

With that simple epistle Pope John XXIII set the agenda of the Council, rendering himself, for a second time, spiritual father of the conciliar document *Nostra Aetate*. (32) The last six months of his governance were filled with intense activity by Cardinal Bea with the Pope’s

⁶ *Matthew* 27: 25

⁷ The reference is to the passage in the *Te Deum* that runs (in translation), ‘Therefore, we beseech Thee come to the aid of the members of the family Thou hast redeemed by Thy precious blood’.

encouragement. After the 'Agape Meeting' of Vatican II, though everyone perceived the contradiction between Cardinal Bea's position and that of the Church, John XXIII sent out a letter of praise signed by the Secretary of State. (33) After that meeting he did something worse a few months later. In *Pacem in Terris* he espoused Bea's heterodox position on 'religious freedom'

John XXIII's responsibility throughout his Pontificate for what followed is clear.

- 1) He changed the Catholic Liturgy in an 'ecumenist' sense, suppressing every teaching to the contrary sustained by almost the entirety of the conciliar fathers;
- 2) He collaborated with, and favoured anti-Christian Associations connected with Freemasonry;
- 3) He approved in full the teaching of Cardinal Bea's schema, even more explicitly than was endorsed, subsequently, in *Nostra Aetate*.

True, he was not the Pope who promulgated it. That was left to Paul VI. But he approved it nonetheless.

What was it with John XXIII that he forgot that in the year 52-53, the converted Pharisee Paul [of Tarsus] had written his old coreligionists that (the Judeans) were those—

"Who both killed the Lord Jesus, and the prophets, and have persecuted us, and who please not God, and are adversaries to all men; prohibiting us to speak to the Gentiles, that they may be saved, to fill up their sins always: for the wrath of God is come upon them to the end." (1 Thessalonians 2: 15, 16))

How did he forget what St. John the Evangelist wrote of those—

"who say that they are Jews and are not, but are a synagogue of Satan" (Apocalypse 2: 9).

Or ignore what the Jews said about Jesus, referring to Him as a "fellow", or applying the epithet of "Balaam" (the ancient soothsayer in Numbers, 22 etc.); and the names "mad", "bastard" and other even more disgraceful things. (34)

He certainly failed to realize that the divergence between Church and Synagogue does not lie in personal issues but in doctrinal and dogmatic ones. He did not accept the reality that Judaism would never accept that the Church is the "new Israel" rendering the previous one obsolescent, nor grasp that the Church would never accept the Jews refusal of the divinity of Jesus Christ.

Why, then, did he facilitate, as [Italy's] Chief Rabbi Toaff declared, that—

"[w]ith the Church, there is [now] an understanding such as it has never been achieved in the past, and the merit goes to John XXIII. (35)

How is it that the Jewish historian Léon Poliakov, could write, "in 1958, a new era was ushered in under the pontificate of... John XXIII?" (36) And that Jewish Paul Giniewski could say,

"The ideas and acts of the new supreme pontiff, John XXIII (1881-1963), rendered possible the hope of a revolution in the relations between the Church and the Jews." (37)

Roncalli's election was welcomed in Israel [whose members] exulted when John XXIII omitted from the divine office for Holy Week in the well-known prayer for the Jews, the adjective perfidious (which⁸, in Medieval Latin, simply signifies "non-believers"). That represented to all the powerful Jewish Associations a measure of [the Church's] approval. John XXIII similarly suppressed words Leo XIII had uttered in his encyclical of 25th May 1899, *Annum Sacrum*,

⁸ While, pejorative in its vernacular renditions...

consecrating humanity to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. It was a most grave act for a Vicar of Jesus Christ.

He did something worse when he suppressed the force of Pius XI's encyclical *Quas Primas* instituting the feast of Christ the King. Pius ordered that the act of consecration to the Sacred Heart set forth in *Annum Sacrum* be publicly recited on Christ the King. Pope Leo's oration ran as follows:

"Be Thou King of all those still immersed in the darkness of idolatry or of Islamism, and refuse not to draw them into the light and the kingdom of God. Turn the eyes of Thy mercy towards the children of that race who were once Thy chosen people. Of old they invoked the Blood of the Saviour upon themselves; may it now descend upon them as a laver of redemption and of life."

John XXIII's actions defy belief and militate against the licitness of any attempt to beatify him.

Again, even if it be thought enthusiasm for the 'ecumenical' cause provided some excuse, how could one be beatified who showed such tepid love for the Virgin Mary? I have already mentioned his perplexities over the proclamation of the dogma of the Assumption (1950). But he held the view also that devotion to the Virgin Mary should not be 'excessive', which departed from [the view of St Bernard endorsed by the Church] *de Maria numquam satis*.⁹ For that reason, he refused to sign a petition for the institution of the *Regalitis Mariae*, writing,

"I strongly beg you to excuse my silence which signals, hitherto, the remarkable vacillation of my spirit, in the fear of a grave prejudice to the apostolic efficacy to bring unity back into the Holy Catholic Church in the world. Jesus dying said to John, "Behold thy mother". That is sufficient to faith and to liturgy (...). The rest can be, and for a great part is, edifying and moving to certain devout and pious souls. To many, many others who may be inclined to the Catholic Church, however, it vexing and, as they say nowadays, counterproductive... Meanwhile, I am content to say: *Salve Regina, Mater misericordiae*". (38)

His Mariology, therefore, was limited, its limits reflected in the sombre Mariology of Vatican II.

It must also be recalled that John XXIII, already a Patriarch, had spoken against the proclamation of the liturgical holiday of the *Royalty of the Virgin Mary*. (39) He reiterated his opposition, which expressed his opposition to the dogmatic definition of the Spiritual Maternity of Mary.

It is clear, therefore, that many of the positions of the "Papa Buono" were far from those befitting a "Good Pope". Real goodness of the one who stands at the helm must always be regulated by prudence, itself, in turn, sustained by the virtue of fortitude, essential in the panoply of the virtues. Otherwise, when elevated to a system of government, 'goodness' becomes a vice. Does not too lenient a doctor render what is sore gangrenous? "He that compromises with error is alien to love in its fulness and sovereign force"... and "charity always cries out for light, and light does not suffer the tiniest shadow of compromise". (40)

Pope John XXIII, therefore, is not a Pope to be canonized. It will suffice to reflect upon the disintegration devastating the Church, today, in the matter of faith, tradition, and discipline:

- disintegration resulting from the dreadful crisis in vocations and from numerous defections of priests and faithful.

⁹ 'Of Mary one can never have enough'.

- disintegration due to the constant promotion of the Communist and atheist mentalities, evils deriving, in great measure, from the lack of insight and lack of discipline in John XXIII's government of the Church.

The “green light” of the Holy See to a process of beatification directly following his death, was thus a rash decision. Its recent acceleration even to setting out a date for the event, is scarcely comprehensible...

As I come to a close, I wish to highlight the unspeakable, because irreconcilable, gesture of proposing simultaneous beatifications for John XXIII and Pius IX. The proposal adds irony to insult for through Pius IX we received the *Syllabus* [of Errors], an instrument which provided a necessary and morally binding defence against the pressing attack of Modernism, the synthesis of all heresies. In John XXIII, in contrast, what we got was a Pope who ditched the *Syllabus*. An attempt to associate these two Popes [by seeking to beatify them together] is a blatant insult to Pius IX's apostolic work.

It was, in fact, certainly not liberal to continue to permit the appointment of bishops by the civilian power. It was certainly not pastoral to accept the liberal demand to substitute for the Christian religion a *deism* that categorised Christian revelation as old junk. It was not pastoral to accept the Constitution of the clergy pursuant to which priests were considered State officials. It was out of the question for any Pontiff to accept the massacre of bishops and priests during the French Revolution. It was out of the question that a Pope would suffer silently the closure of convents and monasteries at the whim of the liberal State. In a word: it was out of the question that the Church could accept an *Illuminist* laity that churned out hosts of progressive political theories which lacked sociality and were bereft of any Christian idea. Pius IX's condemnations, therefore, addressed a political and modernistic totalitarianism that bid fare to descend into the barbarism of Communism.

Pope John XXIII was the antithesis of Pius IX. He discarded the *Syllabus* via Vatican II and with his initiative of embracing the atheistic and criminal ideology, Communism, he harmed the Church of Jesus Christ irrevocably.

I conclude.

One can only be astounded at the two concepts of sanctity which Rome pursues today. There is the *Catholic* sanctity of Pius IX, and the ‘ecumenical’ sanctity of John XXIII. There is the sanctity of a Pope who bravely struggled against the enemies of the Church; and the alleged sanctity of the other, who undermined the defence of the rights of Christ, the God-man, who dismantled the defence of the faithful against the modern evils and exposed them to those very evils—Freemasonry, Communism, sects and false religions.

For the Vatican to be willing to beatify John XXIII together with Pius IX is a clear instance of Modernism in action. It looks to bless the Pope who precipitated the ‘conciliar revision’ with the Pope who defined the *Immaculate Conception* and Papal Infallibility and who, with the *Syllabus* and *Quanta Cura* laid bare the pathogenic germs of contemporary social maladies aimed at destroying the Catholic faith.

This is why, Your Excellency, I intend to manifest to the Holy See my plea that John XXIII not be accorded the honour of beatification.

- 1 Pier Carpi, "The Prophecies of Pope John". The History of Humanity from 1935 to 2033, Rome, 1976.
- 2 His name appears, in fact, in the lists of the P2 Lodge (ref. Ennio Innocenti, "Inimica Vis", Rome, 1990, p. 34). Besides, these "Prophecies of Pope John" were printed by "Edizioni Mediterranee", proximate to Freemasonry!
- 3 "The Lodge is a Glass-House". Interview of Fabio Andriola to Virgilio Gaito published by *L'Italia settimanale* of 26th January, 1994 (n. 3), p. 74.
- 4 "Hearing" n. 832, 12 October 1992, cited by C. D. L. Reporter, May 1995, n. 179, p. 14: "He was in Paris when the non-initiated Angelo Roncalli and Giovanni Montini were initiated, the same day, to the august mysteries of the brotherhood. Not surprisingly, therefore, many things that were realized in the Second Vatican Council by John XXIII, are based on Masonic principles and postulates".
- 5 Aldo Alessandro Mola, "History of Italian Freemasonry from the Unity to the Republic", Bompiani, Milan, 1976, p. 548 e 624. 46
- 6 Fray C. Sante, De Don Miguel Matèu Pla al cisma, pasando por el Nuncio Roncalli, in Que Pasa n. 459, of 14 October 1972, cited by Tomas Tello, "Sombras y penumbras de la figura Roncalli (alias Juan XXIII)", by the author, p. 21 and 22.
- 7 Born in 1899, nephew of Monsignor Le Cam, collaborator of Cardinal Rampolla. In 1946 he became Minister Plenipotentiary of the Sovereign Order of Malta. He met with Nuncio Roncalli in 1947. He had been a mason since 1926.
- 8 These are: *L'Oecumenisme vu par un Franc-Maçon de Tradition*, Vitiano, Paris, 1964 (with dedication to the memory of Angelo Roncalli... To the Father of all the Christians, to the Friend of all Men. To his August continuator, H.H. Pope Paul VI); *De l'initiation maçonnique à l'orthodoxie chrétienne*, Dervy, Paris 1965; *Souvenirs et réflexions: un haut dignitaire de la Franc-Maçonnerie de tradition révéler ses secrets*, Vitiano, Paris 1976.
- 9 Yves Marsaudon, *L'Oecumenisme vu par un Franc-Maçon de Tradition*, Editions Vitiano, Paris 1964, p. 45 46.
- 10 Hebblethwaite, *John XXIII, the Pope of the Council*, Italian Edition, Rusconi, p. 352.
- 11 Marsaudon, cited work, p. 47.
- 12 *Sodalitium*, n. 28, p. 26-27.
- 13 This infiltration is documented and conceded by the Masons themselves, such as Marsaudon (*L'Oecumenism*, cited work, p. 44), and Mola (cited work, p. 599, note 4).
- 14 Monsignor Capovilla himself, John XXIII's secretary, insists that even though aware of the ruling of the Roman Synod of 1960, John XXIII did not issue any new condemnations of Freemasonry. Ref. "John XXIII", in the memory of Monsignor Loris F. Capovilla. Interview of Marco Roncalli, with unpublished documents. San Paolo, Cinisello Balsamo, 1994, p. 87 and 117.
- 15 Léon de Poncins, *Infiltrations ennemies dans l'Eglise*. Documents et témoignages, Paris 1970, p. 85-88.
- 16 Catholic-Masonic discussion at Ariccia, 20th April 1970, in R. Esposito, *The Reconciliation Between the Church and Freemasonry*, Longo, Ravenna, p. 79.
- 17 Alec Mellor, *Dictionnaire de la Franc-Maçonnerie et Franc-Maçon*, Belfond, Paris, 1971-1979, p. 79.

- 18 R. Fabiani, *The Masons in Italy*, L'Espresso, 1970, Farigliano, p. 85.
 - 19 Giordano Gamberini (ex Grand Master) "A Thousand Faces of Freemasons", Rome, Erasmo, 1975, p. 229, quoted by R. Esposito, "Saints and Masons", p. 214.
 - 20 Athenagoras (a Mason) compared John XXIII to John Baptist, precursor of the Messiah, because he prepared the passage of Catholics to a new religion, that of Teilhard de Chardin, whose Messiah would then be his intimate friend, Montini!
 - 21 Esposito quotes some studies according to which, in 1955, there were as many as "17 Bishops" and "500 Anglican Prelates" within the highest Masonic degrees.
 - 22 Hebblethwaite, cited work, p. 328-329.
 - 23 *L'Osservatore Romano*, 19th October 1960.
 - 24 G. Zizola, *John XXIII*, Laterza, Rome-Bari, 1988, p. 221.
 - 25 Decree of the Holy Congregation of Rites on the new ritual for the baptism of the adults: AAS, 54, 1962, p. 315-338.
 - 26 P. Giniewski, *La croix des Juifs*, Ed. MIR, Geneva, 1994.
 - 27 Rigni, "Pope John on the Bosphorus' Shores", Ed. Messaggero, Padua, 1971, foreword by L. Capovilla, p. 197.
 - 28 Isaiah XXIX, 13; Mathew XV, 1-14.
 - 29 John VIII, 42-47
 - 30 Righi, p. 259; ref. Hebblethwaite, cited work, p. 278-279.
 - 31 S. Schmidt, "Agostino Bea, the Cardinal of Unity", p. 568.
 - 32 Idem.
 - 33 Hebblethwaite, "John XXIII, the Pope of the Council", p. 665-666.
 - 34 Giuseppe Ricciotti, "Life of Jesus Christ", Mondadori, (1941), 1974, p. 88.
 - 35 *La Repubblica*, 4 November 1994, p. 14.
 - 36 AA. VV. *Histoire de l'Antisémitisme*, 1945-1993, Seuil, Paris 1994, p. 327
 - 37 Paul Giniewski, *La Croix des Juifs*, MJR ed., Geneva, 1994, p. 329.
 - 38 Alberigo, p. 489, letter dated 22 April 1954, reported in Supreme Priest, p. 178-179.
 - 39 John XXIII, Letters, appendix, n. 57, p. 520; Miccoli, in *Pope John*, by G. Alberigo, *John XXIII and Vatican II*, p. 208.
 - 40 Ernesto Hello, "Man", Florence 1928, p. 70.
-