

# THE TWO CHURCHES

M. J. BAKER

---



---

**Analysis of the State of the Catholic  
Church as we approach the Close of the  
First Quarter of the Twenty First Century**

# Contents

## Chapters

### Introduction

An Ironical Defence of Pope Francis	1
For Love of the Church	9
Paul VI of most infelicitous memory	39
The Church of Paul VI & John Paul II	57
The Modernism of Benedict XVI	77
The Two Churches	95
Two Worm-ridden Popes	111

### *Particular documents*

Pius V, <i>Quo primum</i> , July 14 <sup>th</sup> , 1570	21
Pius VI, <i>Auctorem fidei</i> , August 28 <sup>th</sup> , 1794	27
Masons in the Vatican, December 1978	47
Benedict XVI, Audience February 14 <sup>th</sup> , 2013	86

*Cover image:* Under the loom of *the Church of Vatican II*, Christ's Church, symbolised by the Dome of St Peter's, is struck by lightning on the evening of February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013.

## Introduction

The six papers that make up this little book were written between October 2023 and December 2024 and published on the website [superflumina.org](http://superflumina.org). The order in which they appeared has been altered, each has been amended slightly and footnotes adjusted.

The first paper, ironical in content, serves to demonstrate the folly of relying on anything uttered at Vatican II. The other five present a thesis the author hopes will provide answers to the dilemmas which have confronted the Catholic faithful since the close of that Council and will assist in resolving the confusion for which it is responsible.

The thesis is simple: there is not one Church occupying the Vatican; there are two. One of these is of God; the other is of man, and the devil - a counterfeit, a mocking reflection of the Church founded by Jesus Christ. The two have been at war for more than forty years and in that war the Counterfeit has, up until now, dominated. But events are coming to a head: Pope Francis's days are numbered.

The war, the dilemmas and the confusion the Council has wrought will only be resolved when a Pope is elected who recognises these realities, exposes the Counterfeit for what it is and condemns Vatican II and its importunacy.

Michael Baker    January 6<sup>th</sup>, 2025—*Epiphany of the Lord*

## AN IRONICAL DEFENCE OF POPE FRANCIS

Recently Dr John Lamont, Canadian philosopher and theologian, published a paper asserting that Pope Francis has lapsed from the rigour of the teaching of the Catholic Church and is a heretic.<sup>1</sup> In doing so he has highlighted the disparity between the view of the Church proposed by the Second Vatican Council and that to which the Catholic faithful have adhered for close on twenty centuries.

In his criticism Dr Lamont cited *Dei Verbum* 11 & 12, conceding in doing so that the Second Vatican Council is a reliable authority, an ecumenical council. It is hardly open to him, then, to complain if Pope Francis does the same.

Part of his criticism turns on the replies the Pope has made to a series of *dubia* raised with him some seven years ago by four cardinals. Two of those cardinals having died, the survivors, Cardinals Burke and Brandmüller, were joined by Cardinals Sandoval, Sarah, and Zen in putting to the Pope an amended *dubium*. Its text accepts that the Pope's expression "that the Church can deepen its understanding of the deposit of faith" is what *Dei Verbum* 8 teaches and asserts "this belongs to Catholic doctrine". The Cardinals

---

<sup>1</sup> *Pope Francis as Public Heretic: The Evidence leaves no doubt*. See *Rorate Caeli* at <https://rorate-caeli.blogspot.com/2023/11/pope-francis-as-public-heretic-evidence.html#more>

also invoke *Lumen Gentium* 25. Accordingly they, too, concede that Vatican II is a reliable authority, an ecumenical council. No less than Dr Lamont can they complain if Pope Francis does the same.

The Pope is entitled to rely on the Council's definition of tradition in *Dei Verbum* 8:

"The Tradition that comes from the apostles progresses in the Church with the help of the Holy Spirit. There is a growth in insight into the realities and words that are being passed on. This comes about in various ways. It comes through the contemplation and study of believers who ponder these things in their hearts. It comes from the intimate sense of spiritual realities which they experience. And it comes from the preaching of those who have received, along with their right of succession in the episcopate, the sure charism of truth."

The Cardinals ask: "Is it possible for the Church today to teach doctrines contrary to those she has previously taught in matters of faith and morals?" If the definition in *Dei Verbum* 8 is accepted the answer is 'Yes'. For holding that tradition progresses comprehends its alteration. Growth in insight on the part of believers *via contemplation and study, via their pondering the words and realities transmitted... from the sense of spiritual realities they experience and from preaching* demands change.

Such an interpretation runs counter to the view the Church has long held on what is meant by 'tradition' expressed by the *Council of Trent* and by the (first) *Vatican Council*. It ignores the expression of St Vincent of Lerins, sanctified by repetition, of what is meant by "progress in

understanding” in tradition, that it must be taken “in its own genus alone, namely in the same teaching, with the same sense and same understanding” (*eodem sensu, eademque sententia*). The bishops at Vatican II chose not to endorse those teachings and to give the term this new meaning.

Now consistent with the first law of logic, the law of non-contradiction, it is not open to the Cardinals or to Dr Lamont—to adopt an expression of the English common law—to approbate and reprobate, to acknowledge that the Council was ecumenical, a council whose determinations bind the Catholic faithful, then insist that one may ignore parts of what that Council taught. Let us look at the following.

Dr Lamont cites the (first) *Vatican Council* and its anathemas against what Pope Francis has proposed. But Vatican II paid little attention to anathemas. In *Sacrosanctum Concilium* the Council’s bishops ignored this one, uttered by the *Council of Trent* in Session 7 Canon XIII (on the Sacraments in General);

“If anyone shall say that the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church customarily used in the solemn administration of the sacraments may be disparaged, or be omitted at pleasure by the ministers without sin, or be able to be changed by whomsoever pastor [any pastor whatsoever] of the churches into other new rites: let him be anathema.”

The whole burden of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, the first of the Council’s documents, which the bishops labelled ‘a constitution’, contradicts this statement of *Trent*. It is grounded in the contention that the manner in which

Mass is offered is not, as *Trent* said (and Pope Pius V repeated in 1570 in his bull *Quo primum*), fixed and irreformable, a matter of faith, but one of discipline only and therefore alterable by pope or council. When in 1967 Pope Paul VI published his *novus ordo missae* he simply followed the direction which the Council had dictated in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. Given such example why should Pope Francis, why should the Church, be concerned over past anathemas?

Dr Lamont complains about the Pope differentiating between the testimonies of tradition and the cultural conditioning of these testimonies and elevating cultural conditions to the level of determinants. But the Pope is only conducting himself consistently with Vatican II's teaching *that tradition progresses*. Clearly, altering cultural conditions serve as a means of determining how that progress occurs.

What the Church in the past may have held to be immutable has been gainsaid by Vatican II and it is useless to cite previous ecumenical councils against a pope striving to implement its teachings. What the Church regarded as heretical in the past is simply irrelevant in current cultural conditions. Teachings on faith and morals may have been expressed in a certain way in the past. This cannot inhibit their being expressed in another way now. This is well illustrated with modernism.

What was stigmatised as 'modernist' in the past is now, courtesy of Vatican II and *Dei Verbum* 8, part of the Church's patrimony. This may be inferred from the silence of the Council concerning Pius X's encyclical *Pascendi*

(September 8<sup>th</sup>, 1907) coupled with its refusal to endorse the teachings of the popes against religious freedom, notably those of Gregory XVI in *Mirari vos* (August 15<sup>th</sup>, 1832) and of Pius IX in the *Syllabus of Errors* (December 8<sup>th</sup>, 1864) nn. 15 & 16. Consistent with this, when the Council quoted from Leo XIII's encyclical *Libertas* it avoided mentioning the Pope's teaching that seemed to support Gregory XVI and Pius IX. The new attitude may be inferred, too, from the Council's insistence, against *Pascendi*, that the laity must be involved in the future of the Church. That the laity are to be involved is the central thesis of *Gaudium et Spes*, the Council's Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World. Pope Paul VI confirmed rejection of the authority of *Pascendi* when on July 17<sup>th</sup>, 1967, he abolished the anti-modernist oath for clergy and religious.

Dr Lamont's criticism of the Pope as 'modernist' is, accordingly, misplaced or, not so much misplaced as, irrelevant. If anyone should doubt this, let him look through the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* promulgated by Pope John Paul II almost 30 years after the Council's close, and see if he can find in it any mention of *Pascendi* or of the 'heresy' of modernism.

Dr Lamont criticises what the Pope says in his apostolic letter *Ad Theologiam Promovendam*, namely, that:

- theology must develop using an inductive method, which starts from the different contexts and concrete situations in which peoples are inserted, and allows itself to be seriously challenged by reality;



- the knowledge of people's common sense is a *locus theologicus* that must be privileged first of all by theology;
- theology must enter into the culture, worldview, and religious tradition of a people, and develop into a culture of dialogue and encounter between different traditions and different knowledge, between different Christian denominations and different religions.

Is not the Pope here simply drawing out the implications of what Vatican II taught in *Dei Verbum* 8? Is he not facilitating a means of expression for the growth in insight of believers through their contemplation and study; from their pondering the words and realities transmitted; from the sense of spiritual realities they experience, and from preaching?

If so what is wrong with his suggestion of use of an inductive method? This is the only logical process whereby the faithful may offer theology the fruit of what they discern. Why should believers be precluded from doing so as they draw on their common sense? Does not the Council require the re-thinking of traditional theology to adapt it to current culture, to the zeitgeist and to other religious traditions which the Council required the faithful to acknowledge? Are these not to be included among the spiritual realities believers experience?

Dr Lamont complains of the Pope quoting St Thomas Aquinas out of context. He advances a distinction to show the Pope is wrong to apply a remark made in one context to another. But the Council made a point of quoting St

Thomas out of context as with its claim in *Lumen Gentium* n. 8 that “the unique Church of Christ *subsists in* the Catholic Church”. This recalls St Thomas’s teaching, speaking of God, that subsistence is the noblest form of being. Etymologically the word means ‘that which underlies’ as God underlies everything that exists. It was to this meaning the Council appealed to expand the meaning of Christ’s Church to include those the Church had previously pronounced outside her.

Vatican II demands that the Church adapt herself to the spirit of the age. No longer must she conform herself to the stereotypes of ages past with rigorous adherence to the letter of the scriptures. She must adapt. This may be painful: it will involve departures from the stances on moral issues the Church has previously held, but it must be done. In his writings of which Dr Lamont is so critical Pope Francis is simply giving voice to this movement.

Let us recall that Pope Paul VI declined in the celebrated Washington case to enforce the teaching he had proclaimed in *Humanae Vitae*, an example entire bishops’ conferences were to follow as they accorded the strictures set out in the encyclical little more than lip service. Pope Paul has now been canonised. How could this or any of the elements of his conduct referred to above be viewed as against the welfare of the Church?

Finally, there is the issue and concept of synodality. The teaching of Vatican II is what underlies the now long-standing moves among popes and the episcopacy to

embrace the concept. If there is no consultation, especially with the laity, how can the Church hope, consistent with what the Council so clearly taught, to ensure the growth in insight into the realities and words being passed on? Synodality ensures that there is an outlet for their contemplation and study by believers “who ponder these things in their hearts”, a vehicle through which they may express “the intimate sense of spiritual realities they experience”.

---

## FOR LOVE OF THE CHURCH

There is one thing in this world which is different from all other. It has a personality and a force. It is recognised and, when recognised, either loved or hated. It is the Catholic Church.

Hilaire Belloc<sup>2</sup>

The dilemmas presented for the faithful by the actions of Pope Francis and the members of the Roman Dicasteries under his direction in—

- \* removing bishops from their sees,
- \* suspending, or threatening to suspend, the faculties of priests,
- \* directing priests to refrain from celebrating Mass in the millennial rite,
- \* subverting the integrity of traditional contemplative religious orders by directing that their members depart from the liturgical principles grounding their foundation—

and so on, are each of them susceptible of explanation, if not of ready solution.

Such is the fallibility of human nature—from which no tenant of papal or episcopal office is free—abuses of theological and liturgical principle such as these are by no means unique in the Catholic Church's history. But because the current ones derive from a different, and more vicious, tendency they bear a different character

---

<sup>2</sup> *Letter to Dean Inge in Essays of a Catholic*, London, 1931

### *Understanding the Issues*

The key to understanding this lies in acknowledging what the vast majority of Catholics, regrettably, decline to acknowledge, that the bishops of the Second Vatican Council aided and abetted by Popes John XXIII and Paul VI, under the claim they were engaged in an ecumenical or general council of the Catholic Church, endorsed a raft of heterodox teachings that reveal that claim to be false. Vatican II was a fraud.

There are precedents for a false council. The Second Council of Ephesus (449) convened by the Patriarch of Alexandria was condemned by the ecumenical council that followed it, the *Council of Chalcedon* (451), for erring on the nature of the hypostatic union and was damned by Leo the Great as ‘the Robber Synod’. In 1786 a synod of bishops convoked by the bishop of Tuscany at Pistoia sought to compromise the integrity of the Church with a series of propositions which Pope Pius VI condemned eight years later in the Bull *Auctorem Fidei*. Dz. 1501 - 1599

Anyone prepared to weigh the worth of the Second Vatican Council dispassionately should read Pius VI’s introduction to this Bull and, in particular, the following charge:

“In order not to shock the ears of Catholics, the innovators sought to hide their tortuous manoeuvres by seemingly innocuous words such as would allow them to insinuate error into souls in the subtlest manner. Once the truth had been compromised, they could, by means of slight changes or additions in phraseology distort the confession of the faith

necessary for our salvation and lead the faithful by gradual errors to their eternal damnation. Regardless of the circumstances under which it is used, this manner of dissimulating and lying is vicious. It can never be tolerated in a synod for the reason that a synod's principal glory consists above all in teaching the truth with clarity and excluding all danger of error.

“Moreover, while this is sinful it cannot be excused in the way that one sees it being done, under the erroneous pretext that seemingly shocking affirmations in one place are developed along orthodox lines in others, while in yet other places they are corrected—as if allowing the possibility of either affirming or denying the statement, or of leaving it up to the personal inclination of the individual. Such has always been the fraudulent and daring method used by innovators to establish error. It comprehends both the promoting of error and excusing it.

“It is a most reprehensible technique for the insinuation of doctrinal errors and one condemned long ago by our predecessor St. Celestine who found it used in the writings of Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, [a device] he exposed to condemn it with the greatest possible severity...”

These words might have been written specifically of the popes who promoted, and bishops who attended, the Second Vatican Council.<sup>3</sup>

Since Christ promised that He would never abandon His Church, we can be certain that the Council's errors—errors which have been endorsed by every pope since 1965—will in due course be condemned in like fashion. In

---

<sup>3</sup> A full copy is set forth in part II of the Appendix.

the meantime the faithful, who have suffered much from the Council's imposture, will have more to suffer.

Among the more grievous consequences of the Council was its invention of an entity which has come to exist in parallel with the Catholic Church and to choke her salvific work, 'the Church of Vatican II'. This 'Church', since it is but a secular entity, is bereft of God-given power. The bemusement that has afflicted the Catholic faithful since 1965 arises from the confusion of this entity with the Church founded by Jesus Christ. The Pope, and every bishop, now exercises a man-made authority distinct from the authority given him by God. He may think as he acts that he is doing so as pope, as bishop, when he is busy conducting himself as superior of this un-Godly organisation.

It was inevitable that this entity would come to involve itself in the crucial issue of the choice of pope and this, it would seem, is what happened in March 2013 with the election of Jorge Mario Bergoglio. Vatican II's dysfunction dominated the considerations of the cardinal electors who ignored their obligations as bishops of the Catholic Church. Archbishop Carol Maria Viganò has reminded us of the submission of various prelates of the Church to the imposition of freemasonry whose long established hatred of God is directed to taking control of His Church. There is much to be said for the Archbishop's argument that in Papa Bergoglio the masons achieved their end. The Archbishop might have quoted Leo XIII in the encyclical *Humanum Genus* (April 20<sup>th</sup>, 1884) n. 10:

*“[N]o matter how great may be men’s cleverness in concealment and their experience in lying, it is impossible to prevent the effects of any cause from showing, in some way, the intrinsic nature of the cause whence they come. “A good tree cannot produce bad fruit, nor a bad tree produce good fruit.”[Matt. 7: 18] Now, the Masonic sect produces fruits that are pernicious and of the bitterest savour...”*

Who would deny that the fruits of the Bergoglian pontificate have been most bitter?

As the *Vatican Council* taught in 1870 the power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff,—

*“is immediate; and with respect to this the pastors and the faithful of whatever rite and dignity, both as separate individuals and all together, are bound by the duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, not only in things which pertain to faith and morals, but also in those which pertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the whole world, so that the Church of Christ protected, not only by the Roman Pontiff but by the unity of communion as well as of the profession of the same faith, is one flock under the one highest shepherd. This is the doctrine of Catholic truth from which no one can deviate and keep his faith and salvation.” Dz. 1827*

Once one understands the extent of the papal power in the life of the Church and the Catholic faithful, he realises the enormous ramifications of the papacy’s subversion. If one disagrees with Archbishop Viganò over his rejection of Bergoglio as Pope, he can understand how fidelity to Jesus Christ and the Church He established has driven him to such an extremity.



There is a prayer to Our Blessed Lady for conversion of unbelievers to Christ and His Church published by the predecessor of the *Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith* on December 30<sup>th</sup>, 1868 and re-endorsed on March 18<sup>th</sup> 1936 and on June 10<sup>th</sup>, 1949, which includes this line:

“Call them to the unity of the one fold, granting them the grace to accept all the truths of our Holy Faith, and to submit themselves to the supreme Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ on earth...”

How, in the present situation, could a Catholic repeat this prayer without adding *in pectore* “God protecting them from the fraudulent present incumbent...”? The prayer illustrates the chaos in which the faithful find themselves as a result of that false Council. All the current Pope has done is bring to the surface the viciousness of its determinations and its protocols.

---

So where does the importunity of the current Pope and his henchmen leave the victims of Vatican II? Each of the following prelates has been degraded in office:

- Raymond Cardinal Burke, removed from the office of Prefect of the Apostolic Signatura (on November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014).
- Gerhard Cardinal Müller, removed from his offices as Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, President of the Pontifical Commission ‘Ecclesia Dei’, President of the International Theological Commission, and President of the Pontifical Biblical Commission (all on July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017).

- Bishop Joseph Strickland, removed from his diocese of Tyler in Texas (November 11<sup>th</sup>, 2023).

Such demotions are within the absolute power of the Pope and each of the bishops involved has accepted his demotion benignly.

The treatment of Fr Janvier Gbénou, a priest of the religious organisation *Opus Dei* based on the Ivory Coast, is at another level of harm. Because he has “published texts and commentaries criticizing the Roman Pontiff” the principals of *Opus Dei* have withdrawn his priestly faculties (March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2021) and his permission to celebrate Mass (February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2022). Fr Gbénou contends, with justice, that criticism of the Roman Pontiff is not a canonical infraction, has theological support as old as the Church, and that he has merely followed the advice of the Pope himself who stated publicly that anyone is free to criticise him. These reasons will avail him little. Adherence to logical principle is not a feature of the Vatican’s current tenants as neither was it in the deliberations of the bishops at Vatican II. Many others, including Bishop Athanasius Schneider of Kazakhstan, have been as critical of the Pope as Fr Gbénou but have suffered no sanction.

In his *motu proprio, Traditionis Custodes* (July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2021), Pope Francis purported to impose restrictions on the celebration of Mass in the Church’s millennial Roman rite “to promote the concord and unity of the Church”. He claimed there that the liturgical books promulgated by Popes Paul VI and John Paul II “in conformity with the

decrees of Vatican Council II are the unique expression of the *lex orandi* of the Roman Rite”. But “the concord and unity of the Church” to which he refers are not those of the Church founded by Jesus Christ, the Catholic Church; they are those of ‘the Church of Vatican II’. The document contradicts the Catholic Church’s teaching on the form of Mass in the Roman Rite canonised by Pope Pius V in the Bull *Quo primum* (July 14<sup>th</sup>, 1570) following directions of the *Council of Trent*, accepted by every pope for the 400 years that followed until Paul VI. Little wonder that its terms have been so comprehensively ignored throughout the Church.

Pope Francis has faced trenchant opposition from traditionalist groups and from various bishops over the celebration of Mass in its millennial form. The *Society of St Pius X*, which recognises neither the bans imposed (first impliedly, then explicitly) by Paul VI, nor the qualified ‘permissions’ for its celebration of Paul VI, John Paul II and Benedict XVI, ignores the document. Its members insist, consistent with the directions of *Trent* and the Bull *Quo primum*, that the manner of celebration of Mass is not a matter of discipline to be modified by this pope or that *ad libitum* but, as the essential act of the Church’s worship, the meticulous adherence to it is *a matter of faith* binding all Catholics. They insist, moreover, that consistent with *Trent* and that Bull, any priest has the right to celebrate it *against any direction to the contrary by pope, bishop or superior*.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> As *Quo primum* states explicitly. See part I of the Appendix.

Other societies, such as the *Fraternity of St Peter*, whose existence is also premised on celebration of Mass in its millennial form, have obtained (as their principals think) more recent permissions to continue to celebrate it. Archbishop Viganò has highlighted the precarious position in which these societies are placed because of the concession demanded, as condition of such ‘permissions’, that they admit the spurious Council’s validity.<sup>5</sup>

Since *Traditionis Custodes* Roman Dicasteries under the direction of the Pope have directed certain bishops to ban its celebration. This has occurred *inter alia* in St Patrick’s Cathedral, Melbourne (Australia) and in St Henry’s Cathedral, Helsinki (Finland), and at the shrine of Our Lady of Covadonga (Spain), each of which might be regarded as ‘soft targets’ for the apparatchiks in the Vatican. The severity of these ‘bans’ sounds with the treatment accorded Fr Gbénou as instances where the Vatican can be seen to be exercising ‘authority’ in such a fashion as to limit adverse reaction.

There was much rumour in July 2024 that a papal document was imminent which would ban celebration of the millennial rite outright and it is known that certain members of the Curia and the episcopacy would support such an endeavour. If the plan has been shelved it is to prevent outright rebellion among the faithful. Its

---

<sup>5</sup> A similar dilemma is faced by various orders of monks, canons and nuns, enclosed and non-enclosed.

promoters are right to fear a reaction, but the wisdom that motivates them is not holy. It is the 'wisdom' of the children of this world who fear loss of their authority.

### *A Solution?*

So what, if any, is the solution for the Catholic faithful? In July 2017, some sixty two priests, religious and laymen – including one bishop, Bishop Bernard Fellay of the *Society of St Pius X*, – endorsed a formal charge against Pope Francis, the *Correctio Filialis*, which condemned certain views the Pope had expressed and called on him to repent of his behaviour. The Pope ignored it.

On May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2024, the Feast of St Athanasius, a much smaller group (seventeen in number) with but one priest, and lacking the support of Bishop Fellay, condemned the Pope for his teachings and behaviour and called on him to resign. They asserted, on grounds set forth *in extenso*, that he had committed criminal acts gravely damaging to the Church and to the faithful; that he had shown that he rejects the Catholic faith and has worked to destroy the faith of other Catholics. They urged the cardinals and bishops to ask him to resign and, should he refuse, that they declare that he has lost the papal office.

Only one bishop has been prepared to confront the Pope for his heterodoxy, Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò former apostolic nuncio to the United States of America. There are many others, such as Bishop Athanasius Schneider of Kazakhstan, who while pointing up the raft of theological errors in which Pope and Curia have engaged, counsel

prayerful submission in the expectation that Almighty God will bring a solution in His good time—as indeed He will. He counselled the Vatican against excommunicating Archbishop Viganò, claiming it would lead to further division, which it has.<sup>6</sup>

*Quis custodiet ipsos custodes* – Juvenal’s satiric comment – might be levelled at the episcopacy of the Catholic Church generally. The Church’s bishops are almost universally ineffectual, a consequence of the confusion in which they find themselves as a result of their inability to identify the counterfeit ‘Church of Vatican II’, to distinguish it from the Catholic Church, and failure to realise that the fidelity they owe Christ and His Church is in radical conflict with the allegiance enjoined on them to the Counterfeit.

One of the leading errors of Vatican II’s bishops was their commitment to what Pius X in n. 27 of *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* (September 8<sup>th</sup>, 1907) labelled “that pernicious doctrine that would make of the laity the factor of progress in the Church”. This error underpins *Gaudium et Spes*, the Council’s ‘Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World’.<sup>7</sup> It is ironic that the chief source of opposition to Vatican II, to the popes who inspired it, and those who have promoted it is the same Catholic laity who enjoy a particular immunity from sanction. While Pope

---

<sup>6</sup> *LifeSiteNews* has a petition for Catholics who support the Archbishop with signatories exceeding 20,000.

<sup>7</sup> The document was inspired by the founder of *Opus Dei*, Mons. Jose Maria Escrivá, who was fixated on the laity throughout his priestly life.

and Dicasteries have little hesitation in exercising their perverted ‘authority’ over bishops, priests and religious for daring to disagree with their heterodox views, they are loathe to attempt the same with the lay faithful.

We, Christ’s faithful people then, must persist in prayer and fasting and persevere in criticising the dysfunction in the Vatican. More than a century ago Catholic poet Francis Thompson provided a profound insight into the Catholic Church, the one *thing* in this world different from all others, when he gave it the unique title appearing in this stanza of his last poem—

The Angels keep their ancient places ;—  
Turn but a stone and start a wing !  
‘Tis ye, ‘tis your estrangèd faces,  
That miss the many-splendoured thing.<sup>8</sup>

---

---

<sup>8</sup> *The Kingdom of God*, op. posth., 1907

# Appendix

## Part I

### BULL OF POPE PIUS V

#### *QUO PRIMUM*

July 14<sup>th</sup>, 1570

PIUS, BISHOP OF ROME, SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS  
OF GOD;  
IN PERPETUAL MEMORY OF THE ISSUE

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

1. For, besides other decrees of the sacred Council of Trent, there were stipulations for Us to revise and re-edit the sacred books: the Catechism, the Missal and the Breviary. With the Catechism published for the instruction of the faithful, by God's help, and the Breviary thoroughly revised for the worthy praise of God, in order that the Missal and Breviary may be in perfect harmony, as fitting and proper (for it is most becoming that there be in the Church only one appropriate manner of reciting the Psalms and only one rite for the celebration of Mass) We deemed it necessary to give our immediate attention to what still remained to be done, namely, the re-editing of the Missal as soon as possible.



2. Hence, We decided to entrust this work to learned men of our selection. They very carefully collated all their work with the ancient codices in Our Vatican Library and with reliable, preserved or emended codices from elsewhere. Besides this, these men consulted the works of ancient and approved authors concerning the same sacred rites; and thus they have restored the Missal itself to the original form and rite of the holy Fathers.

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

4. Let everyone everywhere adopt and observe what has been handed down by the Holy Roman Church, the Mother and Teacher of the other churches, and let Masses not be sung or read according to any other formula than that of this Missal published by Us. This ordinance applies henceforth, now, and forever, throughout all the provinces of the Christian world, to all patriarchs, cathedral churches, collegiate and parish churches, be they secular or religious, both of men and of women, even of military orders, and of churches or chapels without a specific congregation in which conventual Masses are sung aloud in choir or read privately in accord with the rites and customs of the Roman Church. This Missal is to be used by all churches, even by those which in their authorisation

are made exempt, whether by Apostolic indult, custom, or privilege, or even if by oath or official confirmation of the Holy See, or have their rights and faculties guaranteed to them by any other manner whatsoever. This new rite alone is to be used unless approval of the practice of saying Mass differently was given at the very time of the institution and confirmation of the church by Apostolic See at least 200 years ago, or unless there has prevailed a custom of a similar kind which has been continuously followed for a period of not less than 200 years, in which most cases We in no wise rescind their above-mentioned prerogative or custom. However, if this Missal, which we have seen fit to publish, be more agreeable to these latter, We grant them permission to celebrate Mass according to its rite, provided they have the consent of their bishop or prelate or of their whole Chapter, everything else to the contrary notwithstanding.

5. All other of the churches referred to above, however, are hereby denied the use of other missals, which are to be discontinued entirely and absolutely; whereas, by this present Constitution, which will be valid henceforth, now, and forever, We order and enjoin that nothing must be added to Our recently published Missal, nothing omitted from it, nor anything whatsoever be changed within it under the penalty of Our displeasure.

6. We specifically command each and every patriarch, administrator, and all other persons or whatever ecclesiastical dignity they may be, be they even cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, or possessed of any other rank or pre-eminence, and We order them in virtue of holy obedience to chant or to read the Mass according to the

rite and manner and norm herewith laid down by Us and, hereafter, to discontinue and completely discard all other rubrics and rites of other missals, however ancient, which they have customarily followed; and let them not in celebrating Mass presume to introduce ceremonies or recite any prayers other than those contained in this Missal.

7. Furthermore, by these presents, in virtue of Our Apostolic authority, We grant and concede in perpetuity that, for the chanting or reading of the Mass in any church whatsoever, this Missal is hereafter to be followed absolutely, without any scruple of conscience or fear of incurring any penalty, judgment, or censure, and may freely and lawfully be used.

8. Nor are superiors, administrators, canons, chaplains, and other secular priests, or religious, of whatever title designated, to be obliged to celebrate the Mass otherwise than as enjoined by Us: We likewise declare and ordain that no one, whosoever he be, is to be forced or coerced to alter this Missal, and that this present document cannot be revoked or modified, but remains always valid and retain its full force notwithstanding previous constitutions and decrees of the Holy See, as well as any general or special constitutions or edicts of provincial or synodal councils, and notwithstanding the practice and custom of the aforesaid churches, established by long and immemorial prescription – except, however, if of more than two hundred years' standing.

9. It is Our will, therefore, and by the same authority, We decree that, after We publish this constitution and the

edition of the Missal, the priests of the Roman Curia are, after thirty days, obliged to chant or read the Mass according to its terms; all others south of the Alps, after three months; and those beyond the Alps either within six months or whenever the Missal is available for sale.

10. Wherefore, in order that the Missal be preserved incorrupt throughout the whole world and kept free of flaws and errors, the penalty for non-observance for printers, whether mediately or immediately subject to Our dominion, and that of the Holy Roman Church, will be the forfeiting of their books and a fine of one hundred gold ducats, payable ipso facto to the Apostolic Treasury. Further, as for those located in other parts of the world, the penalty is excommunication *latae sententiae*, and such other penalties as may in Our judgment be imposed; and We decree by this law that they must not dare or presume to print, to publish, to sell or in any way to accept, books of this nature without Our approval and consent, or without the express consent of the Apostolic Commissaries of those places, to be appointed by Us. The said printer must receive a standard Missal and agree faithfully with it and in no wise vary from the Roman Missal in its large type.

11. Accordingly, since it would be difficult for this present pronouncement to be sent to all parts of the Christian world and simultaneously come to light everywhere, We direct that it be, as usual, posted and published at the doors of the Basilica of the Prince of the Apostles, also at the Apostolic Chancery, and on the street at Campo Flora; furthermore, We direct that printed copies of this same edict signed by a notary public and made official by an

ecclesiastical dignitary possess the same indubitable validity everywhere and in every nation, as if Our manuscript were shown there.

12. Therefore no one, whosoever he be, is permitted to alter this notice of Our permission, statute, ordinance, command, precept, grant, indult, declaration, will, decree, and prohibition; nor is he allowed temerarily to act against it.

Accordingly, should anyone presume to commit such an act, let him know that he will incur the wrath of Almighty God and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.

Given at St. Peter's in the year of the Lord's Incarnation, 1570, on the day preceding the Ides of July (July 14<sup>th</sup>), in the Fifth year of Our Pontificate.

---

## Part II

### BULL OF POPE PIUS VI *AUCTOREM FIDEI*

August 28<sup>th</sup>, 1794

#### *Introduction*

PIUS, BISHOP, Servant of the Servants of God. Greetings and [my] apostolic blessing to all the Christian faithful. The Apostle Paul [1] commands us, who look on Jesus as the author and finisher of the faith, to consider diligently the nature and magnitude of the opposition against Him, which He endured from sinners, so that from time to time we, wearied by labours and dangers, do not lose heart and fall almost lifeless. It is of utmost necessity that We strengthen and refresh ourselves with this most wholesome thought when the raging heat of the dreadful and never-ending conspiracy against the very body of Christ which is the Church [2] takes fire, so that, strengthened in the Lord and in the might of His power, and protected by the shield of faith, we may be able to resist in the evil day and quench the fiery darts of the most wicked one. [3] Truly in these tumultuous times, in this revolutionary upheaval, all good men must join the burdensome struggle against any and all enemies of the Christian name. The guardianship and guidance of the entire flock entrusted to our pastoral care are a more serious matter for Us, upon whom greater zeal for the Christian religion is enjoined, than upon all others. [4] But despite the heavy responsibility set upon our shoulders to bear the burden of all who are heavily laden, the more

aware We are of our own frailty, the more We harbour a more robust hope. The divinely established ruling principle in the person of Blessed Peter lightens the apostolic duty so that he, who never intended to abandon government of the Church once it has been given by Christ, might not cease to carry on his shoulders the burdens of the apostolic governance of those whom God had given to him as heirs to protect and safeguard with a perpetual succession.

And indeed in these hardships that surround us on every side a heap of other troubles have mounded up, as it were, so that what should have been for Us a source of joy is the source of a greater sadness. For in fact, when a leader of God's holy Church under the name of Priest turns the very people of Christ away from the path of truth toward the peril of an erroneous belief, and when this occurs in a major city, then clearly the distress is multiplied, and a greater anxiety is in order. [5]

To be sure this has not occurred in far-off lands but in the full blaze of Italy, under the eyes of the City [viz. Rome], and near the threshold of the Apostles [viz. the tombs of Ss. Peter and Paul]. There was a bishop, distinguished by the honour of two Sees (Scipione de' Ricci, formerly the bishop of Pistoia and Prato), whom we embraced with paternal love as he approached Us to take up his pastoral duty. In the very text of the rite of his sacred ordination he, in turn, bound himself by means of a scrupulous, solemn, oath to the fidelity and obedience due to Us and to this Apostolic See. And yet this same man in the short

space of time after he had left our embrace with the kiss of peace, on going to the people entrusted to him, surrounded himself with the deceits of a pack of teachers of a perverse school of thought.

He began to apply himself but not in the measure he should have, that is to say, by defending, nurturing, and perfecting the praiseworthy and peaceful form of Christian teaching that his bishop predecessors had introduced long ago and had almost secured. Instead, he set about confusing, destroying, and utterly overturning that teaching by introducing troublesome novelties under the guise of a sham reform. Further, when at our urging he had decided upon a diocesan synod, it happened that by inflexible pertinacity in his own way of thinking a more severe occasion of ruin grew out of the source from which we should have looked for some kind of remedy for the wounds [he had precipitated].

Truly, after the Synod of Pistoia emerged from the hiding places in which it had lurked concealed for some time, there was no one with pious scruples and good sense who did not at once warn that the plan of the authors had been to unite into one whole, like a body, the seeds of the vicious teachings they had scattered through numerous pamphlets; to revive errors not long since condemned; and to detract from the faith and authority of those apostolic decrees by which they stood condemned.

When we perceived that the more serious were the problems, the more considerably they demanded the



support of our pastoral care, we did not delay to take those counsels that seemed appropriate, both in healing and suppressing the emergent evil. Being first mindful of the sage advice of our predecessor St. Zosimus, *Those things that are of great importance call for a weighty examination* [6], We directed four bishops and their personal theologians from the secular clergy to examine the Synod that this bishop had produced. Next we assigned a committee of several cardinals of the Roman Catholic Church and other bishops to study diligently the complete collection of [the Synod's] acts, to compare with each other the widely scattered passages and to discuss the opinions formally identified. We personally received their decisions, both orally and in writing.

They decided that the Synod must be universally condemned and that very many of its propositions must be reprov'd with more or less serious censures, some indeed in and of themselves, and others in connection with the formally expressed opinions. After hearing and considering their observations, We also took care that certain leading statements of wrongful teachings taken from it—ones to which the condemnable opinions spread by the Synod directly or indirectly referred—were reduced to a certain order for the future, and that each one of these should be subject to its own special censure.

However, in case obstinate men should seize an opportunity for detraction, notwithstanding either the very carefully conducted comparison of passages or the investigation of the formal opinions, to meet this probable

calumny We determined to make use of the wise counsel, duly and cautiously applied, which several of our most holy predecessors, as well as highly esteemed bishops, and even general councils, had provided, larded with notable examples when they had had cause to restrain the rise of dangerous or harmful novelties of this sort. They knew the capacity of innovators in the art of deception.

In order not to shock the ears of Catholics, the innovators sought to hide their tortuous manoeuvres by seemingly innocuous words [7] such as would allow them to insinuate error into souls in the subtlest manner. Once the truth had been compromised, they could, by means of slight changes or additions in phraseology, distort the confession of the faith necessary for our salvation, and lead the faithful by gradual errors to their eternal damnation. Regardless of the circumstances under which it is used this manner of dissimulating and lying is vicious. It can never be tolerated in a synod for the reason that a synod's principal glory consists above all in teaching the truth with clarity and excluding all danger of error.

Moreover, while this is sinful it cannot be excused in the way that one sees it being done, under the erroneous pretext that seemingly shocking affirmations in one place are developed along orthodox lines in others, while in yet other places they are corrected—as if allowing the possibility of either affirming or denying the statement, or of leaving it up the personal inclination of the individual. Such has always been the fraudulent and daring method

used by innovators to establish error. It comprehends both the promoting of error and excusing it.

It is as if the innovators had pretended they always intended to present the alternative passages, especially to those of simple faith who come to know only some part of the conclusions of such discussions, published in the common language for everyone's use. Or again, as if the same faithful had the ability, without getting confused and avoiding all risk of error, to examine such documents and judge such matters for themselves.

It is a most reprehensible technique for the insinuation of doctrinal errors and one condemned long ago by our predecessor St. Celestine [8] who found it used in the writings of Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, [a device] he exposed to condemn it with the greatest possible severity. Once these texts were examined carefully, the impostor was exposed and confounded, for he expressed himself in a plethora of words, mixing things which were true with others which were obscure; in such a way, at times, that he was able to confess those things which were denied while at the same time possessing a basis for denying the very sentences he confessed. In order to expose such snares, a thing which is frequently necessary in every century, no other method is required than the following: whenever it becomes necessary to expose statements that disguise some suspected error or danger under the veil of ambiguity, one must denounce the perverse meaning under which the error opposed to Catholic truth is camouflaged.

The more freely We embraced a program of complete moderation, the more we foresaw that, in order to reconcile souls and bring them to the unity of spirit in the bond of peace (which, we are glad to say, has by God's favour already happily occurred in many), it would be of enormous assistance to be prepared in case pertinacious sectarians of the synod—if any, God forbid, still remain,—should be free in the future to bring in as allies the Catholic schools and make them partners of their own just condemnation and set in motion new disturbances. They endeavour to entice to their side the clearly unwilling and resistant schools by a kind of distorted likeness of similar terms, even though the schools profess expressly different opinions. Then, if any previously imagined, milder opinion about the synod has hitherto escaped the notice of these imprudent men, let every opportunity of complaining still be closed to them. If they are sound in doctrine, as they wish to appear, they cannot take it hard that the teachings identified in this manner—teachings that exhibit errors from which they claim to be entirely distant—stand condemned.

Yet We did not think that We had sincerely proved our mildness, or more correctly, the charity that impels us toward our brother whom we wish to assist by every means, if We may still be able. [9] Indeed, We are impelled by the charity that moved our predecessor Celestine. [10] He did not refuse to wait with a patience greater than seemed necessary, even against what the law demanded, for priests to mend their ways. For we, along

with Augustine and the Fathers of Milevis, prefer and desire that men who teach perverse things be healed in the Church by pastoral care rather than that they be cut off from Her without hope of salvation, if necessity does not force one to act. [11]

Therefore, so it should not appear that any effort to win over a brother was overlooked, before We progressed further. We thought to summon the aforementioned bishop to Us by means of very cordial letters written to him at our request, promising that we would receive him with good will and that he would not be barred from freely and openly declaring what seemed to him to meet the needs of his interests. In truth, We had not lost hope of the possibility that, if he possessed that teachable mind which Augustine, [12] following the Apostle, required above all else in a bishop, [We would find him amenable to Our direction]. As soon as the chief points of doctrine under dispute, which seemed worthy of greater consideration, were proposed to him simply and candidly, without contention and rancour, [We hoped] he could explain more reasonably what had been proposed ambiguously, and would openly repudiate the manifestly perverse notions displayed. And thus, with his name held in high regard amid the acclaim of all good men, the turmoil aroused in the Church would be restrained as peaceably as possible by a much-desired correction. [13]

But now since he, alleging ill health, has decided not to avail himself of the kindness offered, We can no longer postpone fulfilling our apostolic duty.

It is not a matter of the danger to one or other of the dioceses: any novelty at all assails the Universal Church. [14] For a long time, from every side, the judgment of the supreme Apostolic See has not only been awaited but earnestly demanded by unremitting, repeated, petitions. God forbid that the voice of Peter ever be silent in that See, where, living and presiding perpetually, he presents the truth of the faith to those in search of it. [15] A more lengthy forbearance in such matters is not safe because it is almost as much a crime to close one's eyes in such cases, as it is to preach their offences to religion. [16]

Therefore, such a wound must be healed, a wound which harms not just one member, but the entire body of the Church. [17] With the aid of divine piety We must take care that, with the dissensions removed, the Catholic faith is preserved inviolate and that, once those who defend perverse teachings have been recalled from error, those whose faith has been proved may be fortified by our authority. [18]

After beseeching the light of the Holy Ghost both with our own incessant public and private prayers and also with those of the pious Christian faithful, and after considering everything fully and seasonably, We have resolved to condemn and reprove the several propositions, doctrines, and opinions of the acts and decrees of the aforementioned Synod, either those expressly taught or those conveyed through ambiguity, with their own appropriate notes and censures for each of them (as was

said above), just as We condemn and reprove them in this our Constitution, which will be valid in perpetuity.

They are as follows... [There follow the terms of the condemnations which may be read in the 30<sup>th</sup> edition of *Denzinger* at the locations cited in the text.]

---

### **Footnotes**

Note: the references to Coustant are to the works of the French Benedictine, Pierre Coustant (1654 – 1721).

1. Hebrews 12
2. Colossians 1
3. Ephesians 6]
4. Pope St. Siricius, To Himerius of Tarragona, Epistle 1 in Coustant.
5. Pope St. Celestine I, Epistle 12, in Coustant.
6. Pope St. Zosimus, Epistle 2 in Coustant.
7. Pope St. Leo the Great, Epistle 129, in the edition of Baller.
8. Pope St. Celestine I, Epistle 13, no. 2 in Coustant.
9. Pope St. Celestine I, Epistle 14, To the Clergy and People of Constantinople, no. 8, in Coustant.
10. Epistle 13, To Nestorius, no. 9.
11. Epistle 176, no. 4; 178, no. 2 in the Maurist edition.
12. Book 4, On Baptism Against the Donatists, ch. 5, and Book 5, ch. 26.
13. Pope St. Celestine I, Epistle 16, no. 2 in Coustant.
14. Pope St. Celestine I, Epistle 21, To the Bishops of France.

15. St. Peter Chrysologus, Epistle to Eutyches.
  16. Pope St. Celestine I, Epistle 12, no. 2.
  17. Pope St. Celestine I, Epistle 11, To Cyril, no. 3.
  18. Pope St. Leo the Great, Epistle 23, To Flavian,  
Bishop of Constantinople.
-





## PAUL VI OF MOST INFELICITOUS MEMORY...

“It is no longer Latin but the common tongue that will be the principal language of the Mass. For whoever knows the beauty, the power of Latin, its aptitude in expressing sacred things, this will certainly be a great sacrifice, to see it replaced by the common tongue... We are thus losing to a great extent that admirable and incomparable artistic and spiritual richness that is the Gregorian chant. We have reason, to be sure, to feel regrets and almost a confusion over this...”

Pope Paul VI<sup>9</sup>

In the passage cited above the late Pope Paul VI's insouciance over his action of overturning (or purporting to overturn) the manner in which Holy Mass was to be celebrated, codified by Pope Pius V in 1570 and accepted by each of the thirty three popes who succeeded him, is patent. One would be forgiven for thinking the Pope considered himself but a spectator of the revolutionary events he had precipitated, as if powerless to resist the momentum of history. There is a sort of Hegelian inevitability about the business.

In his study *Phoenix from the Ashes*, historian Henry Sire has remarked:

“[Pope Paul VI] shared the liberal confidence in the modern age as one of enlightenment and reason, as having overcome the crude passions of the past. In his Lenten pastoral of 1962 [then] Cardinal Montini... told the Milanese: ‘today there are

---

<sup>9</sup> Address of November 26, 1969

no errors in the Church, or scandals or deviations or abuses to correct'. This pronouncement, to which the whole of his papacy constitutes a gloss, shows us the degree of acumen with which he judged the contemporary scene...

“[His] most significant weakness was in his judgment of subordinates, displayed disastrously in the matter of the Vatican finances. Central to this was his appointment of Cardinal Jean Villot as secretary of state... An aloof and secretive figure, Villot was the typical *énarque*, promoting the mission of an enlightened elite to dispense progress to the multitude... Paul VI raised him to the cardinalate in 1965, brought him to the Curia two years later, and in May 1969, appointed him secretary of state... Villot remained in office until his death in 1979. He benefited from a measure taken... in direct contrast to the professed aim of de-politicising the Church, whereby the secretary of state was given general authority over all the departments of the Curia, thus introducing a secularisation of the government of the Church under which it has laboured ever since.”<sup>10</sup>

A few pages later Sire goes on:

“One asks, then, how Paul VI has been spared the evaluation due to him, how he can be seen as a promoter of collegial government when his most distinctive policy, the new liturgy, was imposed in contempt of collegial process, how commentators can ignore that the salient fact of his time was the collapse of papal authority, that his pontificate was a trail of scandalous appointments and unheard-of losses. He escapes because everything that he did, or failed to do, tended to the submission of the Church to the world. Since

---

<sup>10</sup> H J A Sire, *Phoenix from the Ashes, The Making, Unmaking and Restoration of Catholic Tradition*, Kettering OH (Angelico Press), 2015, pp. 365, 6

the world was looking for a Church without authority, a pope without authority seemed the appropriate model... In the short term... Paul VI escapes a realistic estimate, but the idols of the present age will not last forever, either in the world or in the Church. When they have passed, he will be judged in the light of the anarchy that he promoted in the Church, the reflection of his own division of mind...”<sup>11</sup>

Sire concludes with the verdict that the reign of Paul VI deserves to be denominated the most disastrous pontificate in the Catholic Church’s history.<sup>12</sup>

In his acerbic commentary on the reign of Paul VI the late Fr Gregory Hesse uttered the comment which we have used as title of this article.<sup>13</sup> Elsewhere he compared him to his disadvantage with the notorious Borgia pope of the 15<sup>th</sup> century: “Better an Alexander VI,” he said, “than Paul VI!”

Reports of the less than honest behaviour of Fr. Giovanni-Batista Montini, the priest who became bishop, cardinal and finally pope are rife. Sire mentions that Pius XII, even as he valued his services, yet suspected Msgr Montini.<sup>14</sup> Pius XII had prohibited his Vatican staff from dealing with the Russians. The Lutheran bishop of Upsala (Sweden), Yngue Torgny Brilioth, informed Pius XII via an emissary

---

<sup>11</sup> *Phoenix from the Ashes*, op. cit., p. 372

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* p. 363

<sup>13</sup> Audio tape n. 15, *Sacred Mass according to Church Law*, at about the 12<sup>th</sup> minute: cf.

[https://archive.org/details/FatherHesse/Fr.+Hesse+-+On+Post-Vatican+II+Canonizations+\(Remastered\).mp3](https://archive.org/details/FatherHesse/Fr.+Hesse+-+On+Post-Vatican+II+Canonizations+(Remastered).mp3)

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 193

that his orders had been contravened. The Pope was reluctant to believe the report but subsequently received incontrovertible evidence that Msgr Montini had been corresponding with various Soviet agencies. Pius XII, as Pius XI before him, had sent priests and bishops clandestinely into Russia to assist Catholics under Communist domination, the bishops to ordain men to the priesthood. Every one of them was arrested by the Russians, tortured and executed, or sent to Siberia. A traitor was discovered in the Vatican, Aligheiro Tondi S.J., who was one of Msgr Montini's advisers.

Accordingly, when on August 30th, 1954 the Archbishop of Milan Cardinal Ildebrando Schuster died, Pius XII lost no time in appointing Msgr Montini to replace him. He declined, however, to bestow upon him the usual accompaniment of that post, a cardinal's hat.

The relation of these events is supported by no less an authority than Alice von Hildebrand, wife of the celebrated Dietrich, as she told how her husband had sought in vain to get Paul VI to address the chaos descending on the Church.

Though Sire hints at a previous indiscretion of Msgr Montini while he was Archbishop of Milan, he does not go into detail nor does he explore the possibility, as explaining the Pope's un-Catholic conduct thereafter, that this indiscretion may have placed him under masonic control. Certain events occurred after John XXIII had made him a Cardinal involving an attempt to bully Msgr Vincenzo Gremigni, Bishop of Novara, who had been an

adviser to Pius XII and was aware of the events surrounding Montini's relegation to Milan. Msgr Montini decided on a certain course with respect to a well-established Catholic newspaper in Lombardy, *Il Popolo d'Italia*. Gremigni protested that such a decision ought not to have been made without consultation with the rest of the episcopate. Msgr Montini's response in a hand-delivered letter was reportedly so violent that Gremigni, who suffered heart problems, collapsed and died while reading it.

Apprised of Gremigni's sudden death, Montini moved to recover the letter and he called on Gremigni's young auxiliary, Ugo Poletti, an hour after midnight. Bishop Poletti made excuses but the Archbishop was not to be denied. Some hours went by, however, before Poletti handed him the letter. The young bishop had apparently taken a copy and his progression through the ranks of the episcopacy to become progressively Archbishop of Spoleto and, in 1973, Cardinal are assessed as flowing from the hold he enjoyed over the Pope. The source of this story is an anonymously authored book entitled *Shroud of Secrecy, the Story of Corruption within the Vatican, published in Italian in 1999*.<sup>15</sup> While one may be concerned over the reliability of what is told, it demonstrates how blackmail may have been used to constrain Paul VI's actions, particularly when one considers the events mentioned hereafter.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Toronto, Canada, 1999, pp.137-8; being a translation into English of *Via col vento in Vaticano*, Milano, 1999. The authors called themselves 'The Millenari'.

<sup>16</sup> Sire adverts to it on p. 368 of his text.

When Paul VI died in August 1978 the assembled cardinals elected as pope the Patriarch of Venice, Albino Luciano, who chose the names 'John Paul'. A disaffected mason, Italian journalist Carmine Pecorelli, approached the new Pope precipitately and provided him with a list of the names of more than one hundred bishops, priests, religious and laity he alleged were members of the masonic sect as evidence of the extent of its infiltration of the Curia and the Church's higher ranks.<sup>17</sup> The list included the names of Cardinals Villot, Casaroli, Suenens and Baggio, and that of *Ugo Cardinal Poletti*. The question for consideration is why Pecorelli should have chosen to make his revelations not to Paul VI but to his successor. A gruesome event lends circumstantial support to the veracity of the list of names provided. Pecorelli was assassinated on a Rome street a few weeks later.

Many will take the view that the most appalling action of Paul VI's pontificate was his betrayal, through the mediacy of Cardinal Casaroli, of Cardinal Mindszenty<sup>18</sup> which the Pope compounded by failing to provide a Church representative at his burial. But that 'honour' belongs to his sycophantic address to the General Assembly of the United Nations on October 5<sup>th</sup>, 1965. There the Pope formally abandoned the Church's constant teaching against 'religious liberty' *two months prior* to the Council's bishops' declaration in support of it, and submitted the Church of Christ and her dignity to the demands of the secular world. Could there be a better indicator that Paul VI was under masonic control?

---

<sup>17</sup> A reproduction of the list is included in the Appendix.

<sup>18</sup> Sire, *op. cit.* p. 379

It is worth repeating the teaching of Leo XIII in *Humanum Genus* (20. 4. 1884) n. 10:

“[N]o matter how great may be men’s cleverness in concealment and their experience in lying, it is impossible to prevent the effects of any cause from showing, in some way, the intrinsic nature of the cause whence they come. A good tree cannot produce bad fruit, nor a bad tree produce good fruit. [Matt. 7: 18] Now, the Masonic sect produces fruits that are pernicious and of the bitterest savour.”

But the most significant issue that affects the reputation of Papa Montini was his breach, mentioned in the opening paragraph of this paper, of the Church’s sacred tradition over the manner in which the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass was to be celebrated. Over 400 years the thirty three popes who followed Pius V down to, and including John XXIII, endorsed—some of them explicitly—the authority of the Bull *Quo primum* (July 14<sup>th</sup>, 1570) as binding in a matter of faith as they would have regarded themselves bound by a dogma formally pronounced.

On March 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1547, the Council of Trent in Session 7 n. 13 (*On the Sacraments in General*) pronounced an anathema on anyone who should say that the received and approved rites of the Church customarily used in the solemn administration of the sacraments may be disparaged, or that are able to be changed into other new rites. If it be objected that this pronouncement could not apply to a pope, let us observe that its ambit is uncircumscribed. The canon reads *per quemcumque pastorem*—“by any pastor whatsoever”. The terms of the condemnation in Pius V’s Bull 23 years later are hardly less intimidating. As noted above he directed—



“No one whosoever he be (*nulli omnino hominum*) is permitted to infringe or rashly contravene this notice of Our permission... nor is he allowed to act against it temerarily. But should anyone presume to attempt to do so, let him know that he will incur the wrath of Almighty God and of Saints Peter and Paul, His Apostles.”

Clearly Paul VI thought himself superior to the demands of *Trent* and of Pius V's Bull. That is, he regarded himself as superior to the Church of which he was the servant—*servus servorum Dei*—the Church established by Jesus Christ, the Word of God.

---

The scuttlebutt attending the person of Msgr Montini prior to and after his elevation to the papacy must have been known to Vatican insiders, including the Prefect of the *Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith*, Josef Cardinal Ratzinger, who on April 19<sup>th</sup>, 2005 became Pope Benedict XVI. Yet this did not preclude him signing, in December 2012, a decree declaring Papa Montini ‘Venerable’. Pope Francis declared him a saint on October 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014.

There could hardly be a better instance of how destructive to the integrity of the Church's processes of canonisation of saints was the step taken by Pope John Paul II in 1983 of abrogating the laws of the Church in which that process was grounded and imposing his own defective vision.

---

## Appendix

### LIST OF MASONS IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Carmine Pecorelli, journalist and disenchanted member of the Masonic entities *Propaganda Due & Grande Oriente d'Italia*, published this list of Masons in the Vatican and its tributaries in December 1978. He was executed by two gunmen on a Rome street on the evening of March 20<sup>th</sup> following.

---

Each man's name is followed by his position, if known, the date he was allegedly initiated into Masonry, his code number; and, where known, his code name.

- Alberto Albondi. Bishop of Livorno, (Leghorn).  
Initiated 8-5-58; I.D. # 7-2431.
- Pio Abrech. Sacred Congregation Bishops. 11-27-67; #  
63-143.
- Sabino Acquaviva. Professor of Religion at the  
University of Padua. 12-3-69;# 275-69.
- Gottardi Alessandro (Addressed as 'Doctor' in  
Masonic meetings). President of Fratelli Maristi. 6-  
14-59.
- Fiorenzo Angelini. Bishop of Messenel, Greece. 10-14-  
57; # 14-005.
- Benedetto Argentieri. Patriarch to the Holy See. 3-11-  
70; # 298-A.
- Augustin Bea. Cardinal. Secretary of State under  
Popes John XXIII and Paul VI.

- Sebastiano Baggio. Cardinal. Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops. Secretary of State under Pope John Paul II from 1989 to 1992. 8-14-57; # 85-1640. Masonic code name "SEBA". Controlled consecration of Bishops.
- Dante Balboni. Assistant to the Vatican Pontifical Commission for Biblical Studies. 7-23-68; # 79-14 "BALDA."
- Salvatore Baldassarri. Bishop of Ravenna, Italy. 2-19-58; # 4315-19. "BALSA."
- Ernesto Balducci. Religious sculpture artist. 5-16-66; # 1452-3.
- Ernesto Basadonna. Prelate of Milan, 9-14-63; # 9-243. "BASE."
- Guilio Batelli. Lay member of many scientific academies. 8-24-59; # 29-A. "GIBA."
- Lorenzo Bedeschi. 2-19-59; # 24-041. "BELO."
- Luigi Belloli. Rector of Seminary, Lombardy. 4-6-58; # 22-04. "BELLU."
- Cleto Belluchi. Coadjutor to Bishop of Fermo, Italy. 6-4-68; # 12-217.
- Luigi Bettazzi. Bishop of Ivera, Italy. 5-11-66; # 1347-45. "LUBE."
- Giovanni Bianchi. 10-23-69; # 2215-11. "BIGI."
- Franco Biffi. Msgr, Rector and Head of St. John Lateran Pontifical University. Controlled what is being taught. Confessor of Pope Paul VI. 8-15-59. "BIFRA."
- Mario Bicarella. Prelate of Vicenza, Italy. 9-23-64; # 21-014. "BIMA."
- Gaetano Bonicelli. Bishop of Albano, Italy. 5-12-59; # 63-1428, "BOGA."

- Giancarlo Boretti. 3-21-65; # 0-241. "BORGI."
- Alberto Bovone. Substitute Secretary of the Sacred Office. 3-30-67; # 254-3. "ALBO."
- Mario Brini. Archbishop. Secretary of Chinese, Oriental, and Pagans. Member of Pontifical Commission to Russia. Controlled rewriting of Canon Law. 7-7-68; # 15670. "MABRI."
- Annibale Bugnini. Archbishop. Author of Novus Ordo. Envoy to Iran, 4-23-63; # 1365-75. "BUAN."
- Michele Buro. Bishop. Prelate of Pontifical Commission to Latin America, 3-21-69; # 140-2. "BUMI."
- Agostino Cacciavillan. Secretariat of State. 11-6-60; # 13-154.
- Umberto Cameli. Director in Office of the Ecclesiastical Affairs of Italy in regard to education in Catholic doctrine. 11-17-60; # 9-1436.
- Giovanni Caprile. Director of Catholic Civil Affairs. 9-5-57; # 21-014. "GICA."
- Giuseppe Caputo. 11-15-71; # 6125-63. "GICAP."
- Agostino Casaroli. Cardinal. Secretary of State under John Paul II from July 1, 1979 until he retired in 1989. 9-28-57; # 41-076. "CASA."
- Flaminio Cerruti. Chief of the Office of the University of Congregation Studies. 4-2-60; # 76-2154. "CEFLA."
- Mario Ciarrocchi. Bishop. 8-23-62; # 123-A. "CIMA."
- Enrico Chiavacci. Professor of Moral Theology, University of Florence, Italy. 7-2-70; # 121-34. "CHIE."
- Carmelo Conte. 9-16-67; # 43-096. "CONCA."
- Alessandro Csele. 3-25-60; # 1354-09. "ALCSE."
- Luigi Dadagio. Papal Nuncio to Spain. Archbishop of Lero. 9-8-67. # 43-B. "LUDA."

- Enzio D'Antonio. Archbishop of Trivento. 6-21-69; # 214-53.
- Donato De Bous. Bishop. 6-24-68; # 321-02. "DEBO."
- Luigi Del Gallo Reoccagiovane. Bishop. Apostolic Delegate of the Pontifical Council for the Laity.
- Aldo Del Monte. Bishop of Novara, Italy. 8-25-69; # 32-012. "ADELMO."
- Danielle Faltin. 6-4-70; # 9-1207. "FADA."
- Giuseppe Ferraioli. Member of Sacred Congregation for Public Affairs. 11-24-69; # 004-125. "GIFE."
- Giovanni Franzoni. 3-2-65; # 2246-47. "FRAGI."
- Vito Gemmiti. Sacred Congregation of Bishops. 3-25-68; # 54-13. "VIGE."
- Giulio Girardi. 9-8-70; # 1471-52. "GIG."
- Angelin Finorenzo. Bishop. Title of Commendator of the Holy Spirit. Vicar General of Roman Hospitals. Controlled hospital trust funds. Consecrated Bishop 7-19-56; joined Masons 10-14-57.
- Massimo Giustetti. 4-12-70; # 13-065. "GIUMA."
- Alessandro Gottardi. Procurator and Postulator General of Fratelli Maristi. Archbishop of Trent. 6-13-59; # 2437-14. "ALGO."
- Mario Gozzini. 5-14-70; # 31-11. "MAGO."
- Carlo Grazinai. Rector of the Vatican Minor Seminary. 7-23-61; # 156-3. "GRACA."
- Antonio Gregagnin. Tribune of First Causes for Beatification. 10-19-67; # 8-45. "GREA."
- Franco Gualdrini. Rector of Capranica. 5-22-61; # 21-352. "GUFRA."
- Annibale Ilari. Abbot. 3-16-69; # 43-86. "ILA."
- Pio Laghi. Nunzio Apostolic Delegate to Argentina, and then U.S.A. until 1995. 8-24-69; # 0-538. "LAPI."

- Giovanni Lajolo. Member of Council of Public Affairs of the Church. 7-27-70; # 21-1397. "LAGI."
- Angelo Lanzoni. Chief of the Office of Secretary of State. 9-24-56; # 6-324. "LANA."
- Virgilio Levi (alias Levine), Monsignor. Assistant Director of Official Vatican Newspaper, L'Osservatore Romano. Managed Vatican Radio Station. 7-4-58; # 241-3. "VILE."
- Lino Lozza. Chancellor of Rome Academy of St. Thomas Aquinas of Catholic Religion. 7-23-69; # 12-768. "LOLI."
- Achille Lienart. Cardinal. Grand Master Mason. Bishop of Lille, France. Recruited Masons. Leader of the progressive forces at Vatican II.
- Pasquale Macchi. Cardinal. Pope Paul's Prelate of Honour and Private Secretary until excommunicated for heresy by Pope Paul VI. Reinstated by Secretary of State, Jean Villot, and made a Cardinal. 4-23-58; # 5463-2. "MAPA."
- Italo Mancini. Director of Sua Santita. 3-18-68; # 1551-142. "MANI."
- Enrico Manfrini. Lay Consultor of Pontifical Commission of Sacred Art. 2-21-68; # 968-c. "MANE."
- Francesco Marchisano. Prelate Honour of the Pope. Secretary Congregation for Seminaries and Universities of Studies. 2-4-61; 4536-3. "FRAMA."
- Paul Marcinkus. American bodyguard. From Cicero, Illinois. Stood 6'4". President for Institute for Training Religious. 8-21-67; # 43-649. Called "GORILLA." Code name "MARPA."

- Salvatore Marsili. Abbot of Order of St. Benedict of Finalpia near Modena, Italy. 7-2-63; # 1278-49. "SALMA."
- Antonio Mazza. Titular Bishop of Velia. Secretary General of Holy Year, 1975. 4-14-71. # 054-329. "MANU."
- Venerio Mazzi. Member of Council of Public Affairs of the Church. 10-13-66; # 052-s. "MAVE."
- Pier Luigi Mazzoni. Congregation of Bishops. 9-14-59; # 59-2. "PILUM."
- Luigi Maverna. Bishop of Chiavari, Genoa, Italy. Assistant General of Italian Catholic Azione. 6-3-68; # 441-c. "LUMA."
- Albino Mensa. Archbishop of Vercelli, Piedmont, Italy. 7-23-59; # 53-23. "MENA."
- Carlo Messina. 3-21-70; # 21-045. "MECA."
- Zanon Messina (Adele). 9-25-68; # 045-329. "AMEZ."
- Dino Monduzzi. Regent to the Prefect of the Pontifical House. 3-11 -67; # 190-2. "MONDI."
- Daimazio Mongillo. Professor of Dominican Moral Theology, Holy Angels Institute of Roma. 2-16-69; # 2145-22. "MONDA."
- Marcello Morgante. Bishop of Ascoli Piceno in East Italy. 7-22-55; # 78-3601. MORMA."
- Teuzo Natalini. Vice President of the Archives of Secretariat of the Vatican. 6-17-67; # 21-44d. "NATE."
- Carmelo Nigro. Rector of the Seminary, Pontifical of Major Studies. 12-21-70; # 23-154. "CARNI."
- Virgillio Noe. Head of the Sacred Congregation of Divine Worship. 4-3-61; # 43652-21. "VINO."
- Vittorie Palestra. Legal Counsel of the Sacred Rota of the Vatican State. 5-6-43; # 1965. "PAVI."

- Salvatore Pappalardo. Cardinal. Archbishop of Palermo, Sicily. 4-15-68; # 234-07. "SALPA."
- Gottardo Pasqualetti. 6-15-60; # 4-231. "COPA."
- Dante Pasquinelli. Council of Nunzio of Madrid. 1-12-69; # 32-124. "PADA."
- Michele Pellegrino. Cardinal. Called "Protector of the Church", Archbishop of Torino (Turin). 5-2-60; # 352-36. "PALMI."
- Giannino Piana. 9-2-70; # 314-52. "GIPI."
- Mario Pimpo. Vicar of Office of General Affairs. 3-15-70; # 793-43. "PIMA."
- Pio Vito Pinto. Msgr. Attaché of Secretary of State and Notare of Second Section of Supreme Tribunal and of Apostolic Signature. 4-2-70; # 3317-42. "PIPIVI."
- Ugo Poletti. Cardinal. Vicar of S.S. Diocese of Rome. Controlled clergy of Rome from 3-6-73. Member of Sacred Congregation of Sacraments and of Divine Worship. President of Pontifical Works and Preservation of the Faith. Also President of the Liturgical Academy. 2-17-69; # 32-1425. "UPO."
- Mario Rizzi. Msgr. Sacred Congregation of Oriental Rites. Listed as "Prelate Bishop of Honour of the Holy Father, the Pope." Worked under Mario Brini to manipulate Canon Law. 9-16-69; # 43-179. "MARI", "MONMARI".
- Florenzo Romita. Sacred Congregation of Clergy. 4-21-56; # 52-142. "FIRO."
- Iginia Rogger. Officer in S.S. (Diocese of Rome). 4-16-68; # 319-13. "IGRO."
- Pietro Rossano. Sacred Congregation of Non-Christian Religions. 2-12-68; # 3421-a. "PIRO."



- Virgillio Rovela. 6-12-64; # 32-14. "ROVI."
- Aurelio Sabbatani. Archbishop of Giustiniana (Giusgno, Milar Province, Italy). First Secretary Supreme Apostolic Signatura. 6-22-69; # 87-43. "ASA"
- Guilio Sacchetti. Delegate of Governors - Marchese. 8-23-59; # 0991-b. "SAGI."
- Francesco Salerno. Bishop. 5-4-62; # 0437-1. "SAFRA"
- Francesco Santangelo. Substitute General of Defence Legal Counsel. 11-12-70; # 32-096. "FRASA."
- Pietro Santini. Vice Official of the Vicar. 8-23-64; # 326-11. "SAPI."
- Ferdnando Savorelli. 1-14-69; # 004-51. "SAFE."
- Renzo Savorelli. 6-12-65; # 34-692. "RESA."
- Gaetano Scanagatta. Sacred Congregation of the Clergy. Member of Commission of Pomei and Loreto, Italy. 9-23-71; # 42-023. "GASCA."
- Giovanni Schasching. 3-18-65; # 6374-23. "GISCHA," "GESUITA."
- Mario Schierano. Titular Bishop of Acrida (Acri in Cosenza Province, Italy.) Chief Military Chaplain of the Italian Armed Forces. 7-3-59; #14-3641. "MASCHI."
- Domenico Semproni. Tribunal of the Vicarate of the Vatican. 4-16-60; # 00-12. "DOSE."
- Sensi, Giuseppe Mario. Titular Archbishop of Sardi (Asia Minor near Smyrna). Papal Nunzio to Portugal. 11-2-67; # 18911-47. "GIMASE."
- Luigi Sposito. Pontifical Commission for the Archives of the Church in Italy. Head Administrator of the Apostolic Seat of the Vatican.
- Leo Suenens. Cardinal. Protector of the Church of St. Peter in Chains, outside Rome. Promoted

Protestant Pentecostalism (Charismatics).

Endeavoured to change much Church dogma when he worked in three different Congregations: 1) Propagation of the Faith; 2) Rites and Ceremonies in the Liturgy; 3) Seminaries. 6-15-67; # 21-64. "LESU."

- Dino Trabalzini. Bishop of Rieti (Reate, Perugia, Italy). Auxiliary Bishop of Southern Rome. 2-6-65; # 61-956. "TRADI."
  - Antonio Travia. Titular Archbishop of Termini Imerese. Head of Catholic schools. 9-15-67; # 16-141. "ATRA."
  - Vittorio Trocchi. Secretary for Catholic Laity in Consistory of the Vatican State Consultations. 7-12-62; # 3-896. "TROVI."
  - Roberto Tucci. Director General of Vatican Radio. 6-21-57; # 42-58. "TURO."
  - David Turollo. 6-9-67; # 191-44. "DATU."
  - Georgio Vale. Priest. Official of Rome Diocese. 2-21-71; # 21-328. "VAGI."
  - Piero Vergari. Head Protocol Officer of the Vatican Office Signatura. 12-14-70; # 3241-6. "PIVE."
  - Jean Villot. Cardinal. Secretary of State to Paul VI. Camerlengo (Treasurer). "JEANNI," "ZURIGO."
  - Lino Zanini. Titular Archbishop of Adrianopoli (Andrianopolis, Turkey). Apostolic Nuncio. Member of the Reverend Fabric of St. Peter's Basilica.
-



# THE CHURCH OF PAUL VI AND OF JOHN PAUL II

*Dignare me laudare te, Virgo Sacrata:  
Da mihi virtutem contra hostes tuos!*

Paul VI's first encyclical *Ecclesiam Suam* (August 6<sup>th</sup>, 1964) displayed many characteristics appropriate to such a solemn papal document reiterating elements of the Catholic faith. It contained admirable passages including, since it was in stark contrast to the determinations at which the bishops of Vatican II subsequently arrived, this: "See how St Paul himself formed the Christians of the primitive church: 'You must not consent to be yokefellows with unbelievers. What has innocence to do with lawfulness?'" [n. 62]

But it also included lapses, serious departures, from the teaching of the Church founded by Jesus Christ which the encyclical claimed to be eulogising.

There was a problem in the very first paragraph. The Pope said: "Jesus Christ founded His Church to be the... mother of all men". This statement without qualification is erroneous. To understand why it is so we have to labour the obvious: when a man speaks he is understood as referring to things not *as they may be*, but *as they are*. That is, he is understood not to speak of things *in potency* but of things *in act*. Our Lord founded His Church for the salvation of those who would embrace His teaching, teaching which His Church repeats. A man has to submit to the Church for her to be his mother and many never

will. To make it clear: the Church is the mother of all men *only in potency*.<sup>19</sup>

This failure indicated a lapse from the sanity of the reasoning of St Thomas Aquinas on which the Church's philosophy is founded.

That this was not an isolated instance was confirmed in n. 9 when the Pope said this: "this is the hour in which the Church should deepen its consciousness of itself", an essay into subjectivism which, in n. 7, he claimed was called for by the deliberations of the currently running Second Vatican Council. His predecessor, Pius XII, had confirmed as late as August, 1950, that the Church's theology is grounded in the realism of St Thomas and condemned excursions into modern philosophy, one of whose flaws is an indulgence in subjectivism according to which truth is determined not by reality but by opinion.<sup>20</sup>

In n. 6 the Pope demonstrated theological incompetence. He said this:

"[I]t is not our intention to express ideas that are either new or fully developed; the ecumenical council exists for that purpose..."

This utterance is, in theological terms, *mala sonans*—offensive to pious ears—in the first place because it runs counter to the clear expression of the *Vatican Council* on

---

<sup>19</sup> This error was to be repeated in faulty translations of the words of consecration in the *novus ordo missae*.

<sup>20</sup> Pius XII, *Humani Generis*, August 12<sup>th</sup>, 1950, nn. 29-34

July 18<sup>th</sup>, 1870 in the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Pastor Aeternus*, that—

“[t]he Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter that by His revelation they might disclose new doctrine, but that by his help they might sacredly safeguard and faithfully expound the revelation transmitted through the apostles as well as the deposit of faith.” Dz. 1836<sup>21</sup>

If it is beyond the power of a pope to express ideas (sc. doctrines) that are new, *a fortiori* is it beyond the power of an ecumenical council. Additionally, the statement savours of *Conciliarism* which would limit the power of the Pope in favour of the bishops.<sup>22</sup>

These failures raise the question of just what ‘Church’ it was that Paul VI had in mind when he penned the opening words which gave the encyclical its eponymous title.

### *The Second Vatican Council*

In the November following the appearance of this encyclical the bishops of the Second Vatican Council in *Lumen Gentium*, their ‘Dogmatic Constitution on the Church’ (November 21<sup>st</sup> 1964), sought, in statements which mixed the heterodox with orthodoxy, to reinvent the

---

<sup>21</sup> *Neque enim Petri successoribus Spiritus Sanctus promissus est, ut eo revelante novam doctrinam patefacerent, sed ut eo assistente traditam per Apostolos revelationem seu fidei depositum sancte custodirent et fideliter exponerent.*

<sup>22</sup> *Vatican Council*, Dogmatic Constitution concerning the Catholic Faith, *Dei Filius*, April 24, 1870, ‘If anyone says that the Roman Pontiff... possesses not the whole plenitude of [the] supreme power... or that this power is not ordinary and immediate... let him be anathema. Dz. 1831

Church by advancing a concept which would make of it a vehicle for humanity's advancement. They said this:

“By her relationship with Christ, the Church is a kind of sacrament or sign of intimate union with God, and of the unity of all mankind.” [n. 1]

This turned reality on its head. The Catholic Church is neither ‘a kind of sacrament’ nor ‘a sign of the unity of mankind’. She is not at the service of men. Rather, men, if they are to come to their proper end, must embrace her. This claim repeated Paul VI's idea in n. 1 of *Ecclesiam Suam* that the Church was founded to be ‘the mother of all men’. Its effect was to change the Church's nature.

But the Council's bishops went further. They proposed a conception of the Church which would embrace those who could have no possible part in her. This is behind their claim in n. 8 that—

“[t]his... unique Church of Christ... subsists in the Catholic Church... although many elements of sanctification... can be found outside her visible structure...”

The verb employed here, the Latin *subsistere*, means ‘to underlie’. The Catholic Church does not *underlie* the Church of Christ. She *is* the Church of Christ, the Church Christ established. Here the bishops sought to circumvent the teaching of her Popes, Councils and Doctors that outside the Church there is no salvation, enunciated by St Cyprian in the Third Century and repeated by the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, by Pope Boniface VIII in 1302, by the Council of Florence 1441 and by Pope Pius XI in 1928, *inter multos alios*.

In n. 15 of the document, in a further indulgence in subjectivism, the bishops spoke as if a Protestant faith (and there are many varieties) differs from the Catholic faith only in degree rather than in kind,<sup>23</sup> and as if Catholics and adherents of Protestant or other heretical sects have something in common.<sup>24</sup> In n. 16 they went even further, asserting that the plan of salvation included “in the first place... the Moslems (who) profess to hold the faith of Abraham and adore together with us... the one merciful God...” Whatever ‘God’ this sect adores, its members reject the divinely inspired Old and New Testaments and condemn the revelation, confirmed by the Church, of the Trinity of Divine Persons in One God. Its ‘God’ is, moreover, far removed from the One Who created mankind in love. St Thomas remarked with justice:

“Mohammed ...did not bring forth any doctrines produced in a supernatural way... On the contrary he said that he was sent

---

<sup>23</sup> “The Church knows that she is joined in many ways to the baptized who are honoured by the name of Christian but who do not however profess the Catholic faith in its entirety or have not preserved unity or communion under the successor of Peter...” Those who deny any element of the Catholic faith are heretics. Their ‘faith’ is not divine (of God) but human only. *Summa Theologiae* II-II, q. 5, a. 3; q. 11, a. 1

<sup>24</sup> “There is... a sharing in prayer and spiritual benefits; these Christians are indeed in some way joined to us in the Holy Spirit for by his gifts and graces his sanctifying power is active in them also and he has strengthened some of them even to the shedding of their blood.” The proposition “that Protestantism is only a different form of the same Christian religion”, was condemned by Pius IX, *Syllabus of Errors*, December 8<sup>th</sup>, 1864, n. 18. That there can be no martyrdom outside the Catholic Church and the Catholic faith is attested to by St Cyprian *The Unity of the Catholic Church* 14; *Letter to Jubaiannus*, 72, 73, and in the writings of St Irenaeus and St Augustine.



in the power of his arms, signs which are not lacking even to robbers and tyrants...”<sup>25</sup>

In n. 3 of the ‘Decree on Ecumenism’, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, published on the same date, the Council’s bishops said this:

“The brethren divided from us... carry out many liturgical actions of the Christian religion. In ways that vary according to the condition of each Church or community, these liturgical actions most certainly can truly engender a life of grace, and, one must say, can aptly give access to the communion of salvation.”

This statement is blatantly heretical. The Church’s teaching on the unity of the Church is set forth *in extenso* in the encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, *Satis Cognitum* (June 29<sup>th</sup>, 1896), whose burden is reflected in this passage in n. 5 where he quotes St Cyprian:

“St. Paul says: ‘All members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body, so also is Christ’ (I Cor. xii, 12). Wherefore this mystical body, he declares, is ‘compacted and fitly jointed together. The head, Christ: from whom the whole body, being compacted and fitly jointed together, by what every joint supplies according to the operation in the measure of every part’ (Eph. iv, 15-16). And so dispersed members, separated one from the other, cannot be united with one and the same head. *There is one God, and one Christ; and His Church is one and the faith is one; and one the people, joined together in the solid unity of the body in the bond of concord. This unity cannot be broken, nor the one body divided by the separation of its constituent parts* (De

---

<sup>25</sup> *Summa Contra Gentiles* Bk. I, ch. vi. n. 4

*Cath. Eccl. Unitate*, n. 23)... What similarity is there between a dead and a living body?"

He confirms this with a further passage [in n. 9] where he quotes St Augustine:

"He who dissents even in one point from divinely revealed truth absolutely rejects all faith, since he thereby refuses to honour God as the supreme truth and the *formal motive of faith*. *In many things they are with me, in a few things not with me; but in those few things in which they are not with me the many things in which they are will not profit them* (In Psalm. liv., n. 19). And this indeed most deservedly; for they, who take from Christian doctrine what they please, lean on their own judgments, not on faith; and not *bringing into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ* (2 Cor. x., 5), they more truly obey themselves than God. *You, who believe what you like, believe yourselves rather than the gospel* (Lib. xvii., *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, cap. 3)."

Finally, though it was published a year after the contentious utterances cited above, *Dei Verbum*, the Council's bishops' 'Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation', deserves to be quoted in one crucial section, n. 8. The bishops said this:

"The tradition that comes from the apostles makes progress in the Church with the help of the Holy Spirit. There is a growth in insight into the realities and words that are being passed on. This comes about in various ways. It comes through the contemplation and study of believers who ponder these things in their hearts. It comes from the intimate sense of spiritual realities which they experience. And it comes from the preaching of those who have received, along with the right of succession in the episcopate, the sure charism of truth. Thus, as the centuries go by, the Church is

always advancing towards the plenitude of divine truth, until eventually the words of God are fulfilled in her.”

This is an attempt to reinterpret the Church’s constant teaching along modernist lines. It effectively denies the Church’s teaching that, because she is of God and not of man, the Church is possessed of the fulness of divine truth. The statement makes a mockery, moreover, of the teaching of the *Council of Trent* in 1546, confirmed and clarified by the *Vatican Council* in 1870, which defines what is meant by ‘tradition’.<sup>26</sup>

The foregoing should suffice to demonstrate that, far from working for the good of Christ’s Church, the bishops of the Second Vatican Council - and Pope Paul VI with them - endeavoured to subvert the Church’s teachings as to her own nature via syncretistic protocols. More than this, they sought to reduce the Catholic Church to an entity dedicated to man, i.e., humanism. No wonder their efforts were welcomed by the scions of freemasonry, deistic offspring of the Protestant Revolt, whose ‘religion’ is focused on man!

It is impossible, therefore, that the documents *Ecclesiam Suam* of Paul VI and *Lumen Gentium*, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, and *Dei Verbum* of the Second Vatican Council could be documents of the Catholic Church;

---

<sup>26</sup> *Trent*, Session IV, April 8<sup>th</sup>, 1546, Dz. 783; *Vatican*, Session III, *Dogmatic Constitution Dei Filius*, Ch. 2 *Revelation*, April 24<sup>th</sup>, 1870, Dz. 1787 & Ch. 4, *Faith & Reason*, Dz. 1800

impossible that that synod of bishops could have been a general or ecumenical council of the Catholic Church.

If anyone is in doubt as to this analysis or of the intent of Paul VI manifest in his actions, it will pay him to study the Pope's Address to the United Nations General Assembly on October 4<sup>th</sup>, 1965. His abandonment of the authority of Christ and of His Church over the world in favour of an institution known to be a creature of Freemasonry ought to appall every Catholic.

*Effect of the Efforts of Paul VI and Vatican II's Bishops*

Because she is of God and not of man, the Catholic Church is not only immaculate but immutable. Hence, the efforts of Pope and bishops to reinvent the Church had no effect on her. *But it had an effect.* It produced a counterfeit of the Catholic Church which thereafter became confused with her. As we will show hereafter, Paul VI's effective successor, Pope John Paul II, confirmed its existence in his first encyclical *Redemptor Hominis* (March 4<sup>th</sup>, 1979) when he identified this entity as 'the Church of the New Advent'.

There was another effect, pernicious in the extreme. The insistence thereafter by popes and bishops that Vatican II was a general or ecumenical council of the Catholic Church brought with it the perception among the faithful that its determinations—however tinged with ambition and lack of charity, however heterodox or outrageous in content—were teachings of the Catholic Church, and that they were bound to follow them.

*Pope John Paul II*

The new Pope, who had been actively involved in the Council as a bishop, set himself the task of reinforcing his predecessor's initiative in his first encyclical *Redemptor Hominis*. He claimed there that he was continuing the program embarked on by Paul VI—

“this great predecessor of mine, who was truly my father...”

[n. 4]

In terminology, whose subjectivist taint rendered it at times incomprehensible, he argued—

“The rich inheritance of the pontificate of Pope Paul VI... has struck deep roots in the awareness of the Church in an utterly new way, quite previously unknown... (3.1)

This endeavour drew the attention of German academic Dr Wigan Siebel, Professor of Political Science in Münster, Germany. In 1980 he published a criticism entitled *The Program of Pope John Paul II* which the reader is invited to download and study.<sup>27</sup> We adopt various salient elements of Dr Siebel's critique in what follows.

“The occupants of the papal throne before John Paul II,” he remarked, “always used the form ‘We’ in order to accentuate unity with the Holy Spirit and at the same time the unity of the faithful. As a sign of the ‘new surge of life’ in the Church the Pope uses the expression ‘I’, which he

---

<sup>27</sup> Under the title *A Study of the Encyclical Redemptor Hominis*, translated from the German by Leonard Latkovski, M.A., O.S.J. with a preface by the translator, available at <http://www.the-pope.com/program2.html>

maintains throughout the encyclical.”<sup>28</sup> It might reasonably be added that the Pope’s solecism was indicative not only of a ‘new surge of life’ but of the new direction in which Paul VI and the Council’s bishops had sought to move Christ’s Church. Let it be noted: *not once in the course of the encyclical did John Paul II use the term ‘Catholic’, or refer to the Church he was lauding as ‘the Catholic Church’.*

Dr Siebel picked up the Pope’s contention that the Church—

“has a new awareness which derives from the Second Vatican Council inspired by Paul VI’s first encyclical, an ‘awareness – or rather self-awareness – by the Church formed in dialogue’, a ‘consciousness, enlightened and supported by the Holy Spirit...”

“In what,” Dr Siebel asked, “does this ‘consciousness’ of the Church consist?” He found the answer in 4.1 of the encyclical:

“The Church’s consciousness must go with the universal openness in order that all may be able to find in her ‘the unsearchable riches of Christ’ (*Eph. 3: 8*). This openness... gives the Church her apostolic urgency or her missionary dynamism...”

To which he added this telling observation: “If the ‘missionary dynamism’ of the Church is in truth an opening of the Church to the whole wide world, the Pope can only be speaking of a kind of mission in reverse! This

---

<sup>28</sup> *A Study of the Encyclical Redemptor Hominis*, op. cit. Part I, A New Advent

is a flooding of the Church by the world, while the Church exposes itself to this inundation through dialogue.”<sup>29</sup>

Dr Siebel went on to refer to the Pope’s invocation of a new ‘revelation’, a term which invokes the Council bishops’ redefining of ‘tradition’ to allow of fresh revelations in *Dei Verbum* 8 referred to above—

“[C]an we fail to have trust... in our Lord’s grace as revealed recently through what the Holy Spirit said, and we heard, during the Council?”

Concerning this claim Dr Siebel remarked, “Vatican II expressed the word of the Holy Ghost and therefore it is not permitted to give up the ecumenic initiative.” He quoted the Pope again—

“True ecumenical activity means openness, drawing closer, availability for dialogue, and a shared investigation of the truth in the full evangelical and Christian sense... The Church is at the same time ‘seeking the universal unity of Christians’.” [6.2]

“Why,” he asks, “does ‘real ecumenical work’ mean ‘openness’? Because the conversion to the Catholic Church and therewith to Catholic truth is not seriously required anymore. The opening to the world, in fact, allows entrance without conversion... [or] commitment. In place of conversion, there is ‘dialogue’; instead of commitment to the truth, there is exchange of views and positions, which by its very nature never comes to an end; rather, all this is carried on in a ‘mutual search for the

---

<sup>29</sup> *A Study of the Encyclical Redemptor Hominis*, op. cit., Part II, The New Church, 1

truth'. If a person already has the truth in the form of Catholic doctrine, can he continue to 'seek for the truth', without actually turning away from it? ... When 'the Church' engages in a search for the very thing which the Church is, we must say that there is a serious incompatibility between Catholic doctrine and what is being spoken of."<sup>30</sup>

Thus Pope John Paul II sought to entrench the rot begun by Paul VI and expressed in innumerable heterodox utterances by the bishops of the Second Vatican Council. As confirmation of this, let the reader study the content of the Pope's Address to the United Nations General Assembly on October 5<sup>th</sup> 1995, the thirtieth anniversary of Paul VI's original abandonment of the authority of Christ and His Church over the world.

### *Our Blessed Lady*

The Blessed Virgin Mary is the mother of the faithful in virtue of her freely consenting to be the Mother of the Saviour, Jesus Christ, the Author of grace and of our spiritual regeneration, and of her Son's designation of her as such when he addressed St John from the Cross. She is no less our mother than was Eve, for while we gain our human life from Eve, from Mary we gain the supernatural life of grace, a created participation in the Divine Life. This life is what St John is referring to when he writes of Christ in the prologue to his Gospel:

---

<sup>30</sup> *A Study of the Encyclical Redemptor Hominis*, op. cit., Part II, The New Church, 4



“He was in the world and the world was made through Him and the world knew Him not. He came into His own and His own received him not. But to as many as did receive Him He gave power to become sons of God, to those who believe in His name...”<sup>31</sup>

Whereas human life comes to us via nature, our spiritual life comes through adoption. But it is not to be thought of as suffering the shortcomings of human adoption.

“It is... much more intimate and fruitful than in ordinary human adoption... Divine adoption... produces sanctifying grace in the soul of the just, thereby making it to participate in the divine nature and to have within itself the germ of eternal life. The soul... endowed thus with grace... is [God’s] child, called to know Him face to face and to love Him for all eternity.”<sup>32</sup>

In human adoption the child shares neither in the father’s family nor in his exercise of human nature. But in Divine adoption the baptised child shares in both the family of God the Father and His nature. In the natural order life is received without a wilful act. In the supernatural order life is received only with a wilful act, that of the child’s parents and then of the man himself once he reaches maturity. To participate he must believe in Christ’s name and conform himself to His precepts.

---

<sup>31</sup> *In mundo erat and mundus per ipsum factus est and mundus eum not cognovits; in propria venit et sui eum non receperunt; quotquot autem receperunt eum dedit eis potestatem filios Dei fieri, his qui credunt in nomine eius...* John 1: 13

<sup>32</sup> Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange OP, Ph.D, S.T.D, *The Mother of the Saviour and Our Interior Life*, trans. Bernard J Kelly Cs.S.Sp., D.D., (Dublin 1949), pp. 188-9.

Fr Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange teaches—

“[I]t is common and certain doctrine, and even *fidei proxima*, that the Blessed Virgin, Mother of the Redeemer, is associated with Him in the work of redemption as secondary and subordinate cause, just as Eve was associated with Adam in the work of man’s ruin.”<sup>33</sup>

In a footnote he adds—

“Many Fathers, followed by many theologians, have noted that if Eve alone had sinned there would have been no Original Sin, and if Mary alone had given her consent without Jesus there would have been no redemption.”

He goes on to quote St Albert the Great—

“The Blessed Virgin Mary was chosen by God not to be his minister but to be His consort and His helper—*in consortium et adiutorium*—according the words of *Genesis*: ‘Let us make him a help like to himself.’”

The Catholic Church compares herself to Mary. St Paul says in *Ephesians* 5: 25-27:

“Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church, and delivered himself up for it that He might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life: that he might present... to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy, and without blemish...”

As, by the ineffable providence of God, Mary was conceived immaculate, so when her Son established His Church did He establish an entity likewise immaculate. The Church is His spotless bride. Like Mary she is a mother *but her motherhood is narrower* than that of the

---

<sup>33</sup> *The Mother of the Saviour and Our Interior Life*, op. cit., p. 184

Blessed Virgin.<sup>34</sup> She is the mother only of those who conform to Christ and to His precepts by embracing her sacraments and her liturgy; in other words, she is mother only of the faithful.

*'Mother of the Church'*

On November 21<sup>st</sup> 1964, at the close of the Third Session of the Second Vatican Council, upon the promulgation of the documents *Lumen Gentium* and *Unitatis Redintegratio*, Paul VI declared the Blessed Virgin Mary—

“Mother of the Church, that is to say, of all Christian people, the faithful as well as the pastors...”

But the Church is not identical with all Christian people! Hence, the reader is entitled to feel the greatest concerns as to the identity of ‘the Church’ to which Paul VI was referring by this title.

Christ’s Church is holy and without blemish: immaculate. She fulfils faithfully her office under the guidance of her Head, Our Blessed Lord. She is compared to Mary. She brings forth to new and immortal life children who are baptised. She is a mother in virtue of her imitation of Mary and, as such, the spotless spouse of Christ. To add to these the claim that Mary is mother of the Church confuses the images these doctrines generate, disturbing the even tenor

---

<sup>34</sup> Eve is the mother of all men *in act*. Their will does not come into it. In contrast, Mary is their mother only *in potency* because they obtain the supernatural life brought into the world through her Son Jesus Christ *only if they will it*. Yet her care for them as Mother is as universal as the Divine Salvific Will. *Daughter of God the Father, Spouse of God the Holy Spirit, Mother of God the Son*, she wills all men to be saved.

of the Church's teaching. This is, doubtless, the reason why over twenty centuries the Church has not insisted on the title, despite the fact that certain popes, bishops and theologians have referred to the reality underlying the claim from time to time.<sup>35</sup>

The errors Paul VI committed in *Ecclesiam Suam*, errors reflected in the novel teachings of the bishops of the Council then in its course, raise a justifiable doubt as to whether it was the Catholic Church to which he was referring in that encyclical, or the idealised entity towards which those bishops were moving under his inspiration, an entity focused, not on God but on man. It is impossible that *this entity*, which Pope John Paul II identified in *Redemptor Hominis* as 'the Church of the New Advent' but which might better be designated 'the Church of Vatican II', is of God.

It is, accordingly, a reasonable position to hold that 'the Church' of which, on November 21<sup>st</sup> 1964, at the close of the Council's Third Session, Paul VI proclaimed Mary 'the Mother', was not Christ's Church *but this counterfeit*. In support of this view Dr Siebel offers this comment:

"The pilgrim People of God, which... is dissolved more and more into the formlessness of mankind, needs 'particularly at our time', a mother whose conceptualisation allows us to forget the Church as the Bride of Christ. Hence, this mother is referred to all men. We now have 'the special characteristic of the motherly love that the mother of God

---

<sup>35</sup> As St Ambrose did; as Pope Leo XIII did in the encyclical on the Rosary *Adjutricem populi* (September 5<sup>th</sup> 1895)

inserts in the mystery of redemption and the life of the church finds expression in its exceptional closeness to man and all that happens to him' (*Redemptor Hominis* 22.4). But if there is a 'Mother of the Church', then the very concept of the Church has... been changed, the time of its institution... pushed back. The Church as an institution can have no mother; she is the Mother of God's People. At the same time, the parallel between Mary and the Church is discarded. As Mother of the Church, Mary stands above the Church; thus is destroyed the idea that Mary is the image of the Church, a concept which has a central importance in our traditional understanding..."<sup>36</sup>

### *Verdict on Pope Paul VI*

It seems clear in retrospect that Paul VI was a Gnostic, in the sense that he thought he knew better than Christ, knew better than the Church He had founded. This characteristic was to manifest itself in his reduction of a central issue of faith, the manner of offering the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, to a mere matter of discipline when in 1968, in breach of the Church's specific prohibitions against doing so which have been referred to above, he substituted for the millennial Roman Rite a form of his own invention.

From all of the above the reader may be moved to agree with the writer that in *Ecclesiam Suam* Pope Paul VI initiated the attempt to divert the Catholic Church from the end intended by Almighty God that she should serve

---

<sup>36</sup> *A Study of the Encyclical Redemptor Hominis*, op. cit., Part II, The New Church, 3

man's salvation, to a means to advance the earthly 'paradise' of humanism.

It is an immense irony that the date he did so, August 6<sup>th</sup>, 1964, should correspond with the date on which he was to die fourteen years later.

---



## THE MODERNISM OF BENEDICT XVI

Having announced his abdication from office, on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2013, Pope Benedict XVI addressed the clergy of Rome for the last time. There is an edited copy of his Address in the appendix. It is an eye witness's account of the euphoria and misconceptions of a vocal minority at Vatican II that led to the harm for which that Council is responsible.

It provides first-hand evidence that the chief influence at work among them was not the theology of the Catholic Church (and her philosophy) but the *nouvelle théologie* identified by Fr Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange O.P. in 1946<sup>37</sup> and condemned by Pius XII in *Humani Generis* in 1950, an ideology of modernist inspiration grounded in modern philosophy's errors. It reveals, moreover, the Council bishops' embrace of the Protestant idyll of conscience - "not a revolutionary act but an act of responsibility" - as they focused on themselves rather than on God.

Its adherents sought to reduce the Church, her divine provenance and her *raison d'être* to the standards of the world in their insistence that the Church must—

- keep up with the times;
- defer to human opinion;

---

<sup>37</sup> Doyen of the University of St Thomas Aquinas in *La nouvelle théologie ou va-t-elle?* (Angelicum, 1946) reproduced as *Where is the new theology leading us?* at <https://ia902804.us.archive.org/26/items/Garrigou-LagrangeEnglish/Where%20is%20the%20New%20Theology%20Leading%20Us%20-%20Garrigou-Lagrange,%20Reginald,%20O.P..pdf>



- respect the claims of other religions by way of ‘dialogue’; and,
- before all else, concern herself with secular demands and the welfare of humanity.

Read what the late Pope has to say and mark its modernist taint. “There was,” he says, “a feeling the Church was not moving forward, that it was declining; that it seemed more a thing of the past...” This defers to the fictional ‘theology’ of Teilhard de Chardin which conceived of the Church as a work in progress, ‘on the way to perfection’, rather than possessed of perfection, the one perfect society on earth as Leo XIII had taught in 1885.<sup>38</sup> Papa Ratzinger ignored, as had the bishops of Vatican II before him, the reality that while the Church exists in time she is, as a divine thing, outside time.

The late Pope went on—

“[W]e knew that the relationship between the Church and the [world]... had been... fraught, beginning with the Church’s error in the case of Galileo... [and] were looking to correct this mistaken start and to rediscover the union

---

<sup>38</sup> Leo XIII *Immortale Dei*, November 1<sup>st</sup>, 1885, n. 10. “This society [the Church] is made up of men, just as civil society is, and yet it is supernatural and spiritual on account of the end for which it was founded and of the means by which it aims at attaining that end. Hence it is distinguished and differs from civil society and, what is of the highest moment, it is a society chartered as of right divine, perfect in its nature and its title, to possess in itself, through the will and loving kindness of its Founder, all needful provision for its maintenance and action.”

between the Church and... the world... so as to open up humanity's future, to open up true progress.”

First, the Church committed no error in the case of Galileo and it is a lie to suggest she did. Moreover, it is notorious that the secular world, desirous of finding some defect in the Church's attitude to experimental science, can find no other instance in history than this where, as historian, Henry Sire, puts it—

“A clash between impudent folly and pompous autocracy has ... been represented as a conflict between science and religion.”<sup>39</sup>

Secondly, the Church does not exist for the sake of the world as if for worldly ends. Nor is she concerned, save *per accidens*, with human progress. Hence, when Papa Ratzinger reported of himself (as *peritus*) and the bishops assembled, that John XXIII “ha[d] called us together to be like fathers, to be an ecumenical Council, a subject that renews the Church”, he was appealing to the misconceptions of the *nouvelle théologie*. Included among these was a defective understanding of what it is that constitutes a general or ecumenical council. No ecumenical council *renews* the Church for the perfect society does not need renewing. An ecumenical council clarifies what is obscure, corrects errors, elaborates so as

---

<sup>39</sup> *Phoenix from the Ashes*, Kettering OH, Angelico Press, 2015, pp. 93-100. The atheists of the French Revolution sent the father of modern chemistry, Antoine Lavoisier, to the guillotine. Though this action was much worse than that attributed to the Catholic Church over Galileo, never a word is published condemning atheism or its exponents.

to enhance the Church's existing good. No ecumenical council would dare endeavour to change the Church's reality which is what the bishops of Vatican II attempted.

The remarks Papa Ratzinger makes as to 'growing together' and 'moving forward' are of a piece with this thinking, as are the references to the Council's 'creativity' and the exasperating slogan 'We are the Church'; as is the replacement of the Church's understanding of herself as *the Mystical Body of Christ* with the reductionist 'People of God'. His appeal to 'all Christians' without distinction exemplifies the syncretism the Council's bishops engaged in, reflected in *Lumen Gentium* n. 15, where the title 'Christian' was extended illegitimately to Protestants and other sects.

His abandonment of distinction here, as with its abandonment by the Council generally, typifies the rejection of the Church's philosophy and, by implication, rejection of the Church herself. For she has ever insisted on exercise of the power of distinction as the essentially rational act.<sup>40</sup> The Church may have insisted time without number on her reliance on the Angelic Doctor's philosophy; Papa Ratzinger knew better (as, indeed, did Papa Wojtyła before him!). His misquoting of St Thomas's teaching on the Trinity in support of the vacuous claim in *Lumen Gentium* n. 8 that the Church "subsists in" the

---

<sup>40</sup> As St Thomas Aquinas insists and Pius XII endorses in *Humani Generis* (12.8.1950). The idiosyncratic, because phenomenologist-infected, view of John Paul II in *Fides et Ratio* (14.9.1998), is in stark contrast.

Catholic Church moved theologian, the late Fr Gregory Hesse, to characterise his argument as a lie.

Pope Benedict says:

“[T]he Church obeys God’s word and does not stand above Scripture. Yet at the same time Scripture is Scripture only because there is the living Church, its living subject; without the living subject of the Church, Scripture is only a book, open to different interpretations and lacking ultimate clarity...”

These misconceptions of Sacred Scripture, of the reality of the Church Christ established and of the relation between the two ought concern every faithful Catholic. Scripture is not “only a book”; it is the revealed word of God. It is not “open to different interpretations” but to those which God’s Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, lays down. Nor does Scripture lack “ultimate clarity”.

In his condemnation of the Church’s perennial use of the Latin tongue and its rigour - as if this impeded rather than rendered precise the sound understanding of Catholic principle - and his repetition of the Council’s errors over involvement of the laity in the liturgy, he repeats errors condemned by Pius VI of the pseudo-synod of Pistoia as “*rash, offensive to pious ears, insulting to the Church and favourable to the charges of heretics against it*”.<sup>41</sup> He goes further when he contends that the Council—

---

<sup>41</sup> *Auctorem Fidei* (August 28<sup>th</sup>, 1794): Dz. 1533; DS. 2633. The errors: *that the liturgy should be simplified, should be conducted in the vernacular and aloud*. Pius VI criticised them for speaking “as if the present order of the liturgy, received and approved by the Church, had emanated in

“open[ed] up all the people, the whole of God’s holy people, to the adoration of God, in the common celebration of the liturgy”—

as if before the Council involvement of the faithful at Mass had been impeded! Implicit in this thinking is denigration of the influence of the Holy Spirit in assuring the perfection of the Church’s liturgy and the propriety of her protocols for man’s salvation throughout history until 1962. A further comment of Fr Hesse is to the point: the Holy Spirit was invited to the Council but the bishops rejected Him.

At the heart of the bishops’ errors, and of Papa Ratzinger’s endorsement, was an attack on the priesthood, the priest as *alter Christus*, diminishing the dignity of the office out of deference to Protestantism, coupled with an illicit exalting of the laity. This is exemplified in his assertions that the Roman liturgy was locked—

“as it were... within the priest’s Roman Missal”—  
and that the Church had conducted herself—

“as if there were two parallel liturgies, the priest with the altar-servers, who celebrated Mass according to the Missal, and the laity, who prayed during Mass using their own prayer books...”

He parrots here the Protestant complaint that the Catholic faith is an esoteric religion when knowledge of her liturgy is, always has been, available through the Church’s missals and catechisms to believer and unbeliever alike.

---

some part from the forgetfulness of the principles by which it should be regulated”.

He blames what he describes as “the Council of the media” for the collapse of the priesthood and religious life that followed the Council, contending that while “the Council of the Fathers was conducted within the faith” this alternative “Council of the Media” was responsible for the damage that resulted. Here is another lie. It was not the media but the Council itself that led some 46,000 priests to abandon their ministries in the twenty years that followed its closure.<sup>42</sup> He claims that “this virtual Council is broken, is lost,” so that “there now appears the true Council with all its spiritual force”. That this assertion is so much nonsense is manifest in the way the Council’s ravaging effects continue in the authority accorded its ‘teachings’ by Pope Francis to justify his depredations on the faith and the faithful alike.

Pope Benedict’s opposition to the teachings of St Thomas ought to have troubled those who had hoped his elevation to the papacy would lead to action against the evils the Council had set in train. This was never going to happen. His Address demonstrates, if there was nothing else available, that Ratzinger had always been part of the evils. His abdication of the Petrine office was no more than a symptom. If the Church is no different to any earthly corporation, what was to prevent its head from retiring when he found the job too demanding? Papa Ratzinger ignored the reality that the pope is the Father of all the

---

<sup>42</sup> A figure which is conservative. It may have been as high as 70,000 according to Romano Amerio, *Iota Unum*, Kansas City, 1996, p. 182.

faithful (that is what the word ‘pope’ means), ignored the fact that a father remains a father forever and that if a father rejects his vocation he betrays his family. The consequences of his betrayal are with us today.

---

Pope John Paul II got his wires crossed when he used the expression ‘the Church of the New Advent’. What he ought to have said was ‘the Advent of a New Church’ for the church he endorsed was not the Catholic Church but *the Church of Vatican II*, a new, modernist, entity. One can detect in Papa Ratzinger’s text acknowledgement of the birth of this new ‘Church’ and its deference to human opinion rather than to Almighty God and His precepts where he says, in meetings with princes of the Church and their *periti* during the Council, that he enjoyed—

“an experience of the universality... and of the concrete reality of the Church which does not simply receive instructions from on high, but grows together and moves forward...”

The bishops of the Second Vatican Council laid the foundation of *this* ‘Church’ with the document *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. They assumed there as a principle something the Catholic Church had 400 years previously rejected, namely, that the manner in which Holy Mass is to be offered is a matter of discipline and reformable.<sup>43</sup> As has been remarked above in this series

---

<sup>43</sup> Ratzinger says: “The first... intention was the reform of the liturgy... begun with Pius XII”. But Pius XII had not sought, with the modifications he introduced, to attack the very structure of the Mass.

of essays at the *Council of Trent*, in Canon 13 of its Seventh Session, the Church condemned this principle:

“If anyone shall say that the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church customarily used in the solemn administration of the sacraments may be contemned, or be omitted at pleasure by the ministers without sin, or be able to be changed by whomsoever pastor (any pastor whatsoever) of the churches, into other new rites: let him be anathema.”

And in obedience to the *Council of Trent*, in the Bull *Quo primum* on July 14<sup>th</sup>, 1570, Pius V canonised the format in which Mass was to be offered thenceforth and declared it irreformable.

When Pope Paul VI invented a liturgy to fit this ‘new church’—the *novus ordo missae*—he closed his mind to the Church’s solemn teaching observed by the thirty three Popes who had preceded him and ignored the anathemas imposed by *Trent* and by Pius V on anyone, including a pope, who would dare to change the Church’s rites.

Of this new church, *the Church of Vatican II*, Paul VI may be a ‘saint’. Given his disobedience to the Church’s explicit teaching on the format of Holy Mass it is inconceivable that any Catholic could regard him as a Saint of the Catholic Church.

---



## **Appendix**

### **MEETING WITH THE PARISH PRIESTS AND THE CLERGY OF ROME ADDRESS OF HIS HOLINESS POPE BENEDICT XVI**

**Paul VI Audience Hall**

**Thursday, 14 February 2013**

Your Eminence, Dear Brother Bishops and Priests,

For me it is a particular gift of Providence that, before leaving the Petrine ministry, I can once more see my clergy, the clergy of Rome...

[T]oday, given the conditions brought on by my age, I have not been able to prepare an extended discourse, as might have been expected; but rather what I have in mind are a few thoughts on the Second Vatican Council, as I saw it...

.....

[O]ff we went to the Council not just with joy but with enthusiasm. There was an incredible sense of expectation. We were hoping that all would be renewed, that there would truly be a new Pentecost, a new era of the Church, because the Church was still fairly robust at that time... However, there was a feeling that the Church was not moving forward, that it was declining, that it seemed more a thing of the past and not the herald of the future. And at that moment, we were hoping that this relation would be renewed, that it would change; that the Church might once again be a force for tomorrow and a force for today. And we knew that the relationship between the Church and the modern period, right from the outset, had been slightly fraught, beginning

with the Church's error in the case of Galileo Galilei; we were looking to correct this mistaken start and to rediscover the union between the Church and the best forces of the world, so as to open up humanity's future, to open up true progress...

I remember that the Roman Synod was thought of as a negative model... The bishops said... [w]e are bishops, we ourselves are the subject of the Synod; we do not simply want to approve what has already been done, but we ourselves want to be the subject, the protagonists of the Council... The Pope has called us together to be like Fathers, to be an Ecumenical Council, a subject that renews the Church. So we want to assume this new role of ours.

.....

Everyone... came with great expectations... but not everyone knew what to do. The most prepared, let us say, those with the clearest ideas, were the French, German, Belgian and Dutch episcopates, the so-called "Rhine alliance". And in the first part of the Council it was they who pointed out the path; then the activity rapidly broadened, and everyone took part more and more in the creativity of the Council... The first, initial, simple – or apparently simple – intention was the reform of the liturgy, which had begun with Pius XII, who had already reformed the Holy Week liturgy; the second was ecclesiology; the third was the word of God, Revelation; and finally ecumenism. The French, much more than the Germans, were also keen to explore the question of the relationship between the Church and the world.

Let us begin with the first theme. After the First World War, Central and Western Europe had seen the growth of the liturgical movement, a rediscovery of the richness and depth

of the liturgy, which until then had remained, as it were, locked within the priest's Roman Missal, while the people prayed with their own prayer books... seeking to translate the lofty content, the elevated language of classical liturgy into more emotional words... But it was as if there were two parallel liturgies: the priest with the altar-servers, who celebrated Mass according to the Missal, and the laity, who prayed during Mass using their own prayer books, at the same time, while knowing substantially what was happening on the altar. But now there was a rediscovery of the beauty, the profundity, the historical, human, and spiritual riches of the Missal and it became clear that it should not be merely a representative of the people, a young altar-server, saying *Et cum spiritu tuo* and so on, but that there should truly be a dialogue between priest and people... And in this way, the liturgy was rediscovered and renewed.

[It] was a very good idea to begin with the liturgy, because in this way the primacy of God could appear... Some have made the criticism that the Council spoke of many things, but not of God. It did speak of God! And this was the first thing that it did, that substantial speaking of God and opening up all the people, the whole of God's holy people, to the adoration of God, in the common celebration of the liturgy of the Body and Blood of Christ...

.....

Then there were the principles: intelligibility, instead of being locked up in an unknown language that is no longer spoken, and also active participation. Unfortunately, these principles have also been misunderstood. Intelligibility does not mean banality, because the great texts of the liturgy – even when, thanks be to God, they are spoken in our mother tongue – are not easily intelligible, they demand ongoing

formation on the part of the Christian if he is to grow and enter ever more deeply into the mystery and so arrive at understanding...

And now the second topic: the Church. We know that the First Vatican Council was interrupted because of the Franco-Prussian War, and so it remained somewhat one-sided, incomplete, because the doctrine on the primacy – defined, thanks be to God, in that historical moment for the Church, and very necessary for the period that followed – was just a single element in a broader ecclesiology, already envisaged and prepared. So we were left with a fragment. And one might say: as long as it remains a fragment, we tend towards a one-sided vision where the Church would be just the primacy. So all along, the intention was to complete the ecclesiology of Vatican I, at a date to be determined, for the sake of a complete ecclesiology... Above all, there was a rediscovery of the concept that Vatican I had also envisaged, namely that of the Mystical Body of Christ. People were beginning to realize that the Church is not simply an organization, something structured, juridical, institutional – it is that too – but rather an organism, a living reality that penetrates my soul, in such a way that I myself, with my own believing soul, am a building block of the Church as such...

I would say that theological discussion in the 1930's and 1940's, even in the 1920's, was entirely conducted under the heading *Mystici Corporis*... [W]ithin this context emerged the formula: We are the Church, the Church is not a structure; we Christians, all together, we are all the living body of the Church. And naturally, this obtains in the sense that we, the true “we” of believers, together with the “I” of Christ, are the Church; every single one of us, not a particular “we”, a single group that calls itself Church. No: this “we are Church” requires me to take my place within the great “we”

of believers of all times and places. Therefore, the primary idea was to complete ecclesiology... besides the succession of Peter, and his unique function, to define more clearly also the function of the bishops, the corpus of bishops. And in order to do this, the word “collegiality” was adopted, a word that has been much discussed, sometimes acrimoniously... But this word... expressed the fact that the bishops collectively are the continuation of the Twelve, of the corpus of Apostles... Hence it is the corpus of bishops, the college, that is the continuation of the corpus of the Twelve...

These, let us say, were the two basic elements – and in the meantime, in the quest for a complete theological vision of ecclesiology, a certain amount of criticism arose after the 1940’s, in the 1950’s, concerning the concept of the Body of Christ: the word “mystical” was thought to be too spiritual, too exclusive; the concept “People of God” then began to come into play. The Council rightly accepted this element, which in the Fathers is regarded as an expression of the continuity between the Old and the New Testaments. In the text of the New Testament, the phrase *Laos tou Theou*, corresponding to the Old Testament texts, means – with only two exceptions, I believe – the ancient People of God, the Jews, who among the world’s peoples, *goim*, are “the” People of God. The others, we pagans, are not *per se* God’s People: we become sons of Abraham and thus the People of God by entering into communion with Christ, the one seed of Abraham. By entering into communion with him, by being one with him, we too become God’s People. In a word: the concept of “the People of God” implies the continuity of the Testaments, continuity in God’s history with the world, with mankind, but it also implies the Christological element. Only through Christology do we become the People of God, and thus the two concepts are combined. The Council chose

to elaborate a Trinitarian ecclesiology: People of God the Father, Body of Christ, Temple of the Holy Spirit.

Yet only after the Council did an element come to light – which can also be found... in the Council itself – namely this: the link between People of God and Body of Christ is precisely communion with Christ in Eucharistic fellowship. This is where we become the Body of Christ: the relationship between People of God and Body of Christ creates a new reality – communion... [I]t is as a result of the Council that the concept of communion came more and more to be the expression of the Church's essence, communion in its different dimensions: communion with the Trinitarian God – who is himself communion between Father, Son and Holy Spirit – sacramental communion, and concrete communion in the episcopate and in the life of the Church.

Even more hotly debated was the problem of Revelation. At stake here was the relationship between Scripture and Tradition... [T]he exegetes... were anxious for greater freedom; they felt themselves... in a position of inferiority with regard to the Protestants, who were making the great discoveries, whereas Catholics felt somewhat “handicapped” by the need to submit to the Magisterium... What is the meaning of Tradition? It was a multifaceted struggle... but the important thing... is that Scripture is the word of God and that the Church is under Scripture, the Church obeys God's word and does not stand above Scripture. Yet at the same time Scripture is Scripture only because there is the living Church, its living subject; without the living subject of the Church, Scripture is only a book, open to different interpretations and lacking ultimate clarity.

Here the battle – as I said – was difficult, and an intervention of Pope Paul VI proved decisive. This intervention shows all

the delicacy of a father, his responsibility for the progress of the Council, but also his great respect for the Council... [T]he Pope transmitted to the Council, I believe, fourteen formulae for a phrase to be inserted into the text on Revelation... I remember more or less the formula *non omnis certitudo de veritatibus fidei potest sumi ex Sacra Scriptura*, in other words, the Church's certainty about her faith is not born only of an isolated book, but has need of the Church herself as a subject enlightened and guided by the Holy Spirit... This phrase... is decisive, I would say, for showing the Church's absolute necessity, and thus understanding the meaning of Tradition, the living body in which this word draws life from the outset and from which it receives its light, in which it is born...

... [T]hanks to the Pope and thanks, we may say, to the light of the Holy Spirit... there emerged a document which is one of the finest and most innovative of the entire Council...

Finally, ecumenism... [I]t was obvious – especially after the “passions” suffered by Christians in the Nazi era – that Christians could find unity, or at least seek unity, yet it was also clear that God alone can bestow unity...

The second part of the Council was much more extensive. There appeared with great urgency the issue of today's world, the modern age, and the Church; and with it, the issues of responsibility for the building up of this world, of society, responsibility for the future of this world and eschatological hope, the ethical responsibility of Christians and where we look for guidance; and then religious freedom, progress, and relations with other religions... [The] great document *Gaudium et Spes* analysed very well the issue of Christian eschatology and worldly progress, and that of responsibility for the society of the future and the responsibility of

Christians before eternity, and in this way it also renewed a Christian ethics, the foundations of ethics. But... alongside this great document there arose another... this was the Declaration *Nostra Aetate*.

From the beginning our Jewish friends were present, and they said, primarily to us Germans, but not to us alone, that after the tragic events of the Nazi period, the Nazi decade, the Catholic Church had to say something about the Old Testament, about the Jewish people... Thus it was clear that our relationship with the world of the ancient People of God needed to be an object of reflection... But there is religious experience, with a certain human light from creation, and therefore it is necessary and possible to enter into dialogue...

Therefore, these two documents, on religious freedom and *Nostra Aetate*, linked to *Gaudium et Spes*, make a very important trilogy whose importance has been demonstrated only after decades...

I would now like to add yet a third point: there was the Council of the Fathers – the real Council – but there was also the Council of the media... And while the Council of the Fathers was conducted within the faith... the Council of the journalists, naturally, was not... It was obvious that the media would take the side of those who seemed to them more closely allied with their world... There was this threefold question: the power of the Pope, which was then transferred to the power of the bishops and the power of all – popular sovereignty. Naturally, for them, this was the part to be approved, to be promulgated, to be favoured. So too with the liturgy: there was no interest in liturgy as an act of faith, but as something where comprehensible things are done, a matter of community activity... Sacrality must therefore be abolished, and profanity now spreads to worship... no longer



worship, but a community act... These... trivializations of the idea of the Council, were virulent in the process of putting the liturgical reform into practice; they were born from a vision of the Council detached from its proper key, that of faith...

We know that this Council... was accessible to everyone. Therefore, [it] was the dominant one... and it created so many disasters, so many problems, so much suffering: seminaries closed, convents closed, banal liturgy... the virtual Council was stronger than the real Council. But the real force of the Council was present and, slowly but surely, established itself more and more and became the true force which is also the true reform, the true renewal of the Church. It seems to me that, 50 years after the Council, we see that this virtual Council is broken, is lost, and there now appears the true Council with all its spiritual force... Let us hope that that the Lord will assist us. I myself, secluded in prayer, will always be with you and together let us go forward with the Lord in the certainty that the Lord will conquer.

Thank you!

---

## THE TWO CHURCHES

*Quia non relinquet Dominus virgam peccatorum  
super sortem iustorum: ut non extendant iusti ad  
iniquitatem manus suas.*

Ps. 124: 3

The French have an expression—*les extremes se touchent*—‘the extremes meet’. In the persons of Pope Paul VI and the members of a vigorous minority of the attending bishops, two extremes, two evils, met at the Second Vatican Council, freemasonry and modernism. The two derived from the same source, the Protestant Revolt, but came via different routes. The one began shortly after that disaster; the other took centuries for its malevolence to appear.

Freemasonry was a ‘natural’ effect of Luther’s rejection of God’s authority in favour of that of the ‘believer’. The bastardised ‘belief’ to which it gave rise soon descended into Deism (which respects a God that exists only in the believer’s mind) and ended in a practical atheism. Freemasonry adopted the Protestant protocol of vain oaths by which tyrants such as Henry Tudor (King Henry VIII via his creature Thomas Cromwell) compelled his subjects out of fear to swear solemnly that what was false was true.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> On this topic see E. E. Reynolds, *The Field is Won: The Life and Death of St Thomas More*, Milwaukee, 1968, pp. 294 et seq., and particularly footnote 8.

The heresy of modernism has its ground in the philosophical ills to which Luther's revolt gave rise and did not appear until they had begun to flourish. The first of these, with Bacon, was *materialism* - nothing exists but what is material. The second appeared when Descartes turned reality on its head, *subjectivism*. These two distortions dominated the thinking of the Enlightenment and, in due course, produced the heresy which attacks *all* belief in God. All claim of the existence of a transcendent God, its adherents maintain, is ephemeral for nothing exists which is not material or detectable by the senses and religious belief is reduced to an affectation, a subjective preoccupation, of 'the believer'.

Pius X condemned the modernist heresy comprehensively in 1907 (*Pascendi Dominici Gregis*) but it reappeared among rebellious priests and theologians in the decades that followed to be given expression in the vaunted *nouvelle théologie* whose tenets Pius XII condemned in 1950 in the encyclical *Humani Generis*.

Masons and modernists, not so much by their numbers but by the pertinacity of their ideas and their control of both John XXIII (implicitly) and Paul VI (explicitly), dominated the gathering at the Second Vatican Council to divert the honour due to Almighty God—from Whom all authority derives—to man. They did so via the modernist protocols *syncretism* (all religions are the same) and *humanism* (if religion is to have any focus, it is on man, not God). The masons' contribution was to apply the atheistic triduum of the French Revolution, liberty, equality and

fraternity. In the Council's documents these became *religious liberty, collegiality and ecumenism*.

By the Council's end Paul VI and the Council's bishops reckoned they had altered the direction, teaching and end of the Catholic Church. They had not. Since Christ's Church is of God Who is immutable, her direction, teaching and end are likewise immutable. What Pope and bishops had done was something else: they had produced a Counterfeit, an entity which, pretending to be the Catholic Church, proclaimed a new religion with a false direction, false teaching and a false end. Their 'Church' became confused with the Catholic Church, its operations intermingled with her operations, its teachings advanced as her teachings, its administration asserted to be her administration.

In consequence the popes and bishops who followed the Council found themselves possessed of an office *additional* to that each received on his consecration, that of a superior of this counterfeit Church. And, as the thing Paul VI and the Council's bishops had created was malevolent—of the devil (who delights in confusion)—so was the additional office bestowed on them. And just as malevolent were the effects it was to work in the decades that followed.

---

The two Popes together with the Council's bishops – complaisant, or unthinking or just plain negligent – permitted the malevolent vocal minority in their midst to drive them to embrace modern philosophy's facile tenets

in substitution for the Catholic Church's perennial philosophy. It will assist if we elaborate the consequences of this collective action on the thinking of its proponents and on the lives of the faithful who depended on them.

Men of common sense have little difficulty recognising distinctions to solve problems. Modern philosophy prefers simple, i.e., simplistic, answers. The preference is logical for distinctions involve *formalities*, immaterial realities, and modern philosophy rejects any reality that is not material or not physically detectable. Hence, the modernist, confuses,—

- act and potency—what *does be* / what does not yet be *but can be*;
- form and matter—that in a thing *which determines* it / that in it *which is determined*;
- objective and subjective—what is real / what is only conceived of as real;
- validity and licitness—*whether* something is done / *whether it is allowed* to be done;
- what is of faith (and immutable) / what is only of discipline (and alterable);
- what in human affairs is fixed / what is variable;
- *the natural* (which is of God) / *the voluntary*, or wilful (which is of man);
- divine faith, the gift of God and Catholic / the merely human faith of any other religion.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> The verb 'to confuse' and its cognate noun 'confusion' are apt, for they signify 'poured together'.

The *modus operandi* adopted by the operatives at Vatican II was to close their minds to the reality exemplified in the history of the Catholic Church over twenty centuries, in favour of ‘a concept’ of the Church at which they arrived collectively. As noted above, this ‘concept’ was *syncretistic* as to religion and *humanistic* as to focus. Via *syncretism* they did away with the exclusivity that belongs to the one and only Church founded by God—or so they thought. Via *humanism* they reduced the end of the Church to the service of mankind—or so they thought.

### *The Two Churches*

It must first be insisted that the rot which precipitated the emergence of the Counterfeit began with Pope John XXIII. In him there first appeared a carelessness about the principle embodied in the papal oath instituted by Pope St Agatho (678 – 681)—

“I vow to change nothing of the received Tradition, nothing thereof I have found guarded by my God-pleasing predecessors before me, to encroach upon, to alter, or to permit any innovation therein...”

John XXIII’s foolish decision to call a synod of the Church’s bishops to ‘update’ the Church - as if the Church was not *eo ipso* timeless - and to bestow on it the title ‘ecumenical council’ was his principal error. He seemed to think it sufficient to call a synod ‘ecumenical’ to make it so.<sup>46</sup> But *what something is*, its essence or nature, is a function of *why it is*: finality determines formality. The only reason that can justify a general, or ecumenical, council of the

---

<sup>46</sup> This is subjectivism at work: ‘the truth is what I assert it to be’.

Catholic Church is the need to address some issue crucial to her good. *There was no such issue.* John XXIII admitted as much in his opening speech. Three years later, his successor, Paul VI confirmed that there was no such issue in the Council's closing speech.<sup>47</sup>

By this shared act of papal incompetence a way was opened for the invasion of the sanctuary of God by the devil. Paul VI was to lament the fact publicly some seven years after the Council's closing, utterly blind to the extent of his own contribution.<sup>48</sup>

It is possible to identify 'the Church' produced by Paul VI and the Council's bishops and give it a name, or names. One was supplied by the Pope's Deputy Secretary of State, Archbishop Giovanni Benelli in June 1976 when, at the bidding of his principal, Jean Cardinal Villot, he sought to divert Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, one of the 'rebel' bishops at the Council, from the intention of ordaining candidates to the priesthood dedicated to offering Mass in the millennial Roman rite. Benelli promised the Archbishop that Rome would look after his seminarians if they were "seriously prepared for a priestly ministry in true loyalty to the *Conciliar Church*".

The Archbishop ignored him and ordained the priests on June 29<sup>th</sup>. Three weeks later the Secretary of the *Sacred*

---

<sup>47</sup> For a study of this reality see *The Trouble with Dignitatis Humanae—II. The Dilemma*, at

[https://www.superflumina.org/PDF\\_files/dignitatis\\_humanae\\_2.pdf](https://www.superflumina.org/PDF_files/dignitatis_humanae_2.pdf)

<sup>48</sup> Statement of June 29<sup>th</sup>, 1972

*Congregation of Bishops* advised him that Paul VI had imposed on him the punishment of suspension *a divinis*, depriving him of the right to confect the sacraments. The Archbishop's reaction is instructive:

“When all is said and done, this suspension forbids me... to say the New Mass or to give the new sacraments. I am asked to obey the ‘Conciliar Church’, as Archbishop Benelli calls it. But this Conciliar Church is schismatic because it breaks with the Catholic Church of all time. It has its new dogmas... its new priesthood, its new institutions, and its new liturgy which have... been condemned in so many official and definitive documents.”<sup>49</sup>

Here the Archbishop exposed for us the reality of the two Churches.

Despite the claim implicit in Paul VI's conduct, that he had acted as Pope in imposing this penalty, he had acted in another capacity, that of superior of the *Conciliar Church*. Since this entity' was a merely human enterprise, its operations and direction contrary to those of the Catholic Church, it was quite incapable of providing the Pope with the power he had purported to exercise.

Paul VI died just over two years later in August 1978. In March the following year his successor, Pope John Paul II, in his first encyclical, *Redemptor Hominis*, gave the counterfeit Church another name. He called it *the Church*

---

<sup>49</sup> Quoted in Bishop Tissier de Mallerais, *The Biography Marcel Lefebvre*, transl. from the French by Brian Sudlow M.A., Kansas City MO, (Angelus Press) 2004 at p. 487.



*of the New Advent*. But it is perhaps best identified, by reference to its source, as *the Church of Vatican II*.

Two Churches, then, the one of God, the other of man. Once this duopoly and the confusion the Popes and the Council's bishops generated are acknowledged there appears a solution for the innumerable dilemmas that have confronted the Catholic faithful ever since.

\* It explains the confusion generated by the opposition of John XXIII to the Church's bi-millennial condemnation of the Jews over Christ's execution at their hands, and his endeavour to emasculate the Church's Divine Office to accord with his preoccupation. The root of the Pope's problem was the modernist refusal to make distinctions. The Church's regard for the Jews is spelled out by St Paul in *Romans* Ch. 9:

"I would willingly be condemned and be cut off from Christ if it could help my brothers of Israel, my own flesh and blood. They were adopted as sons, they were given the glory and the covenants; the Law and the ritual were drawn up for them, and the promises were made to them. They are descended from the patriarchs and from their flesh and blood came Christ who is above all, God for ever blessed!"

But the Church's desire to awaken them to the reality that the long expected Saviour had appeared among them in the person of Jesus Christ did not diminish the reality that their malice had brought about His suffering and death, for which sin they were justly condemned. For fifteen centuries the Church had invoked the teaching of St Augustine on the topic, reproduced in Matins during the

Easter Triduum, but John XXIII knew better than Christ's Church! How rightly did Pius X remark of its exponents: "Pride sits in modernism as in its own house".

\* It explains how Paul VI could think himself entitled to invent a Mass departing from the millennial form of Mass in the Roman Rite. The applicable liturgical principle is *lex orandi statuit legem credendi* - 'the law of what is to be prayed determines the law of what is to be believed'. The Pope having assisted in the creation of a different Church, principle demanded that this Church should have a different liturgical rite. This new - this *different* - rite of Mass, the *novus ordo missae*, dictates the new and schismatic law of belief of that Church.

\* It explains how Paul VI could think he could ignore the clear terms of the *Council of Trent* and Pius V's 1570 bull *Quo primum* and carry the bishops with him. Pope and bishops were at one in reducing a matter of faith, *eo ipso* immutable, to the level of mere discipline, changeable by any pope. Behind the Pope's solecism is the modernist refusal to acknowledge the distinction between the two.

\* It explains why the Church's bishops are so ineffectual, why one never hears one of them speak out on any of the innumerable moral disorders that arise in society every week. Since each celebrates *daily* this defective rite of Mass, he is compelled to conform himself to its *defective* law of belief, an element of which is its heterodox attitude

to absolute and moral liberty.<sup>50</sup> Though each bishop insists upon his episcopal dignity and authority, the vast majority conduct themselves as superiors of the schismatic *Church of Vatican II* whose heterodox teachings have neutered their episcopal powers.

\* It explains the confusion among traditional Catholics who think that the authorisation of priests to offer, and of faithful to attend, the millennial form of the Roman Rite of Mass comes from the current Pope - whoever he be - rather than from the Church herself granted once, and forever, by *Trent* and *Quo primum*. When they concede, as a condition of their adherence to the millennial rite, the legitimacy of the Second Vatican Council they fall into a trap. For they concede the principle adopted by Paul VI, that the mode of offering Mass is never more than a matter of discipline. This error leads them into another, and worse, error, one of self-contradiction. When they complain that they should be able to follow the 'permission' given for celebration of the millennial rite by

---

<sup>50</sup> In *Dignitatis Humanae* n. 3, the Council proclaimed: "No merely human power can either command or prohibit [the internal, voluntary and free] acts [whereby a man sets the course of his life directly towards God]." This false exaltation of absolute liberty rejects the ordinary teaching of the Catholic Church contained in Leo XIII's *Libertas praestantissimum* (June 20<sup>th</sup>, 1888) and the social Kingship of Christ proclaimed by Pius XI in *Quas Primas* (December 11<sup>th</sup>, 1925). Leo said: "it is quite unlawful to demand, to defend, or to grant unconditional freedom of thought, of speech, or writing, or of worship as if these were so many rights given by nature to man. [If it was so] it would be lawful to refuse obedience to God and there would be no restraint on human liberty." (*Libertas*, n. 42)

Benedict XVI in *Summorum Pontificum*, and ignore withdrawal of that 'permission' by Pope Francis in *Traditiones Custodes*, they behave irrationally. If the manner in which Mass is offered is only a matter of discipline, *Pope Francis is entitled to suppress it* and they are bound to obey him rather than his predecessor.

\* It explains the avalanche of 'saints' canonised after Pope John Paul II abandoned, on January 25<sup>th</sup>, 1983, the rigour of the Church's examination of causes. Of course they are saints - saints of the schismatic *Church of Vatican II!* It remains to be seen how many will survive the proper investigation of their causes when, untrammelled by the demands of its Counterfeit, Christ's Church resumes the exclusive authority over her operations.

\* It explains the endeavours of recent popes and bishops to foist the nonsense of synodality on the faithful, an evil begun by Paul VI in 1967. This abuse is grounded in two errors promoted by the Council and embraced by *the Church of Vatican II*: that the Catholic Church should be a democratic rather than hierarchical institution, and that the laity should have a voice in her management and government. Vatican II's denial of the reality (despite its bishops' protestations to the contrary) that she has a living Head in Jesus Christ and that she is subservient to Him and therefore hierarchical in structure, coupled with abandonment of the explicit teaching of Pius X in *Pascendi* n. 27, illustrates once again the illegitimacy of the claim that that Council was a work of the Catholic Church.

\* It explains the omissions, and departures from, Catholic principle manifest in the 1994 *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. The document makes no mention of the contributions to the Church's teaching of the only Pope canonised in 400 years, St Pius X, on the significant issue of admission to Holy Communion of those who reach the age of reason. It makes no mention of the Pope's syllabus condemning the errors of the modernists, *Lamentabili Sane* (July 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1907), or of his encyclical on the doctrine of the modernists, *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* (September 8<sup>th</sup>, 1907). These lacunae and Paul VI's unilateral decision, against Catholic principle, to abolish the anti-modernist oath required of all priests and religious, demonstrate that the *Catechism* is not so much a work of the Catholic Church as of *the Church of Vatican II*.

\* It explains Pope Francis's direction that the Catholic Church's teaching on the death penalty be reversed and that the 1994 *Catechism* be amended accordingly. The issue, a fetish of *the Church of Vatican II*, was shared by his predecessors, John Paul II and Benedict XVI. John Paul had called for its abolition as early as 1999, labouring the point in public utterances throughout his pontificate. Benedict repeated the call in his 2011 Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation *Africae Munus*. The Catholic Church's teaching remains what it has ever been, that there are circumstances where the good of society demands that a man be put to death:

“[T]he common good is better than the particular good of one person. So, a particular good should be removed in order to preserve the common good. But the life of certain

pestiferous men is an impediment of the common good which is the concord of human society. Therefore, certain men must be removed by death from the society of men...

“[Just as] the physician properly and beneficially removes a diseased organ if the corruption of the body is threatened... the ruler of a state executes pestiferous men justly and sinlessly in order that the peace of the state may not be disrupted.”<sup>51</sup>

But in the confused and comingled operations of the two Churches, and thanks to its capture of the person of the Pope himself, *the Church of Vatican II* is the dominant of the ‘partners’ in the Vatican and able to demand that Catholic orthodoxy be compromised little by little.

\* It explains the aberrance of the teachings of Pope Francis throughout the course of his reign. When he utters these heterodox statements he is not speaking as Pope but as superior of the schismatic *Church of Vatican II*.

---

### *Communicatio in Sacris*

Perhaps nothing better distinguishes the two Churches—that the one is of God, the other of man—than their respective attitudes to *communicatio in sacris*, the sharing by priests or faithful of the holy things of God with unbelievers, or the sharing by priests or faithful in the services or ‘sacraments’ of unbelievers. St Paul in II *Corinthians* (6: 15-16) is explicit:

---

<sup>51</sup> St Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles*, Bk. III, ch. 145, nn. 4, 5.

“For what have Christ and Belial in common? Or what does the believer share with the unbeliever? And what has the temple of God in common with idols? For you are the temple of the living God, as God says: I will dwell in them and walk among them, and I will be their God and they shall be my people.”

The Catholic Church’s teaching is set forth in the 1917 *Code of Canon Law*, Canon 1258 § 1:

It is unlawful for the faithful to assist in any active manner, or to take part in the services of non-Catholics.

To which Canon 2316 added this force:

He who voluntarily and knowingly aids the propagation of heresy or who takes part in services with heretics against the command of can. 1258 is suspect of heresy.

In contrast, the new *Code* designed by Paul VI’s advisers *inter alia* to pass into law the errors promoted by Vatican II (which was to be published under Pope Paul and then under Pope John Paul, and finally promulgated by John Paul II on January 25<sup>th</sup>, 1983) contains provisions, Canons 844 § 2, 3 and 4, *which allow communicatio in sacris* explicitly. Thus, Canon 844 § 4—

If there is a danger of death or if, in the judgement of the diocesan bishop or of the episcopal conference, there is some other grave and pressing need, Catholic ministers may lawfully administer these same sacraments to other Christians not in full communion with the Catholic Church who cannot approach a minister of their own community and who spontaneously ask for them, provided they demonstrate the Catholic faith in respect of these sacraments and are properly disposed.

Since these provisions traduce the constant teaching of the Catholic Church, it is impossible that they could be part of a Code of Canon Law of the Catholic Church. They can only be provisions of a Code for *the Church of Vatican II*.<sup>52</sup>

It is essential, once Christ's Church has returned to the position of command in her household and the schismatic interloper and its pernicious influence is removed, that the 1983 *Code* be purified of each and every contentious provision, and that it be revised faithfully to reflect the Church's teachings, after the fashion of the 1917 *Code*.

---

---

<sup>52</sup> The same comment can be made of the new Canon 1055 § 1 with its reversal of the order of the ends of marriage, a reflection of the error of the Protestants which was adopted by the Council's bishops in the document *Gaudium et Spes* n. 48. There St Paul's teaching in *Ephesians* 5: 25 is misquoted as if authorising the novelty. In nn. 50 and 51 the change in emphasis, subtle but real, is maintained. The error was repeated by Paul VI in *Humanae Vitae* nn. 9 & 12.





## TWO WORM-RIDDEN POPES

It is almost impossible to find a satisfactory report of what child visionaries, the shepherds Maximin Giraud and Mélanie Calvat, were told when, on September 19<sup>th</sup>, 1846, they were attended by the Blessed Virgin at La Salette-Fallavaux in the Department of Isère in south eastern France. Allegations of censorship abound. Two items have been mentioned as excised from the children's reports. The first is that Rome would lose the faith and become the seat of anti-Christ; the second, that there would appear in the century, or centuries, to come two worm-ridden popes – *deux papes vermoulus*.<sup>53</sup>

On the supposition that these reports are true, let us explore the possibilities.

### *Rome Will Lose the Faith*

There can be little doubt that the first of the prophecies has been fulfilled with the current Vatican administration featuring a Pope, who not only indulges in heterodoxy but allows it to be broadcast that he no longer regards himself as the Vicar of Christ, attended by a Curia the majority of whose members offers no opposition to his dissent from Catholic principle.

---

<sup>53</sup> The reader will find the first of these repeated by Archbishop Viganò in his paper *I accuse Bergoglio of Heresy and Schism* available on the internet. The second is featured in a video and audiotape of the late Fr Gregory Hesse reproduced here <https://www.bitchute.com/video/OxIjJ5Z5UARn/>

Yet it should not be thought that this appalling state of affairs was precipitated by the conduct of Pope Francis alone, or even with the elevation of Jorge Mario Bergoglio to the papacy. He is but the end result of a process that began with John XXIII's decision to summon a synod of the Church's bishops on the supposition that merely to label the resulting convocation 'a general or ecumenical council of the Catholic Church' was sufficient to make it so. As remarked above, a council is ecumenical or general only if it is convoked to address some issue for the good of the Church, and there was no such issue.

This shared act of papal incompetence opened a way for the invasion of the sanctuary of God by the forces of the devil.

In John XXIII's utterances after his elevation to the papacy there had been causes for concern.<sup>54</sup> When Giovanni Battista Montini succeeded him these concerns were augmented. Paul VI's first encyclical *Ecclesiam Suam* ignored Catholic principle when its author embraced subjectivism.<sup>55</sup> Far from intervening to correct the Council's bishops over their problematic utterances, he encouraged them.

His successor, Karol Wojtyła, Archbishop of Kraków, formed in the defective philosophy of phenomenology,

---

<sup>54</sup> See *The Two Churches* above.

<sup>55</sup> See *The Church of Paul VI and of John Paul II* above.

had been a major contributor to the thinking of the Council's bishops, his own subjectivism supporting the abandonment of Catholic principle in which they engaged. It was appropriate that he should as Pope have adopted the name taken by his short-lived predecessor for he was to continue the revolution John XXIII had begun and Paul VI had nurtured.

Josef Cardinal Ratzinger who succeeded John Paul II as Benedict XVI had been one of the Council's *periti*. It seems he would have liked to moderate the effects of the revolution in which he had played a part. He appeared divided in his allegiances and to lack the strength of character to act decisively. His resignation from the papacy in February 2013 left the faithful to the care of the Archbishop of Buenos Aires whose heterodox opinions seem to have been patent even before his election. In truth, the departures from Catholic principle in which the bishops appointed after the Council indulged made it inevitable that sooner or later the cardinals would elect a candidate completely unsuitable for the supreme office.

Now, if Rome no longer preaches the fulness of the Catholic faith, it is the seat of anti-Christ.

The Council's effect was the creation of a counterfeit of the Catholic Church, *the Church of Vatican II*, which under the influence of Pope and bishops thereafter assumed the guise of the Catholic Church. These two Churches, the one of God, the other of man (and the devil), are - have been for forty years and more - at war. Through the

Counterfeit and its instruments, the succeeding popes, bishops and clergy, the devil has worked to convince the faithful that the direction of Christ's Church has changed, that its operations are her operations, its teachings her teachings, its administration her administration. In this struggle, the Counterfeit has, for the moment, the upper hand for the Pope is a heretic who claims to be speaking for God but is not.

Yet the efforts of these complaisant ministers have not served to compromise the Catholic Church's integrity. Since she is of God and not of man, her direction, teaching and end are immutable. She is indefectible and infallible and, in due course, she will throw off the incubus of the Counterfeit and resume her wonted authority.

#### *Deux Papes Vermoulus*

As to the second prophecy we ought to consider what Our Blessed Lady meant by 'worm-ridden'? It is clear she spoke on analogy with an attack from the foundations of a wooden structure. The inferences to be drawn are, surely, that the two popes to whom she refers, bound by their acceptance of the office inherited from St Peter, the Rock on whom the stability of the Church and security of the faith is guaranteed to defend the faith, would fail to do so.

In 1870 the *Vatican Council* under Pope Pius IX taught that the Catholic faith—

“has not been handed down as a philosophic invention to the human mind to be perfected, but... entrusted as a divine deposit... to be faithfully guarded and infallibly interpreted...

[and that] that understanding of its sacred dogmas is to be perpetually retained which Holy Mother Church has once declared... there... never be[ing] recession from that meaning under the specious name of a deeper understanding..."<sup>56</sup>

Only among those associated with the *Second* Vatican Council, after John XXIII, are there to be found popes who have sought to recede from the meaning of the Church's sacred dogmas. Let us look at the possible claimants to the title - Paul VI, John Paul II, Benedict XVI, Francis.

### *Paul VI*

There is every reason to agree with theologian, the late Fr Gregory Hesse, in according **Paul VI** the 'honour' of the first nomination. We have set out in an earlier paper details of his dishonesty and duplicity while working for Pius XII and of an allegation of misbehaviour while he was Archbishop of Milan which, one may rationally conclude, placed him under masonic control.<sup>57</sup> There is further evidence of this, if it be needed, in his employment as Secretary of State of Jean Cardinal Villot, later revealed as a mason.<sup>58</sup>

Paul VI's conduct during the Second Vatican Council provides abundant evidence that the concept of the Church he entertained departed radically from the reality of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic entity founded by Our Blessed Lord. He endorsed the Council's bishops' illogical behaviour. His expressed support for the self-

---

<sup>56</sup> Dogmatic Constitution *Dei Filius*, April 24<sup>th</sup>, 1870, Dz. 1800

<sup>57</sup> See *Paul VI of Most Infelicitous Memory...* above

<sup>58</sup> See the Appendix to the paper *The Two Churches*.

contradictory document rejecting the Church's teaching against 'religious freedom', *Dignitatis Humanae*, is eloquent of his refusal to adhere to Catholic principle. By this single action he persuaded 179 of the attending bishops to abandon their opposition to it, leaving a rump of only seventy opposed.

Further evidence against him is found in his opposition to Archbishop Lefebvre's efforts to train priests dedicated to offering Mass in the millennial form of the Roman Rite. During a Consistory on May 24<sup>th</sup> 1976, he reproached the Archbishop publicly for refusing *today's* authority in the name of *yesterday's* (as if the Church's authority varied with time), for "leading people into disobedience on the pretext of keeping the faith intact", and for refusing the New Mass because of a "sentimental attachment" to the old. "This [the establishment of the *novus ordo missae*]," he claimed, "is nothing less than what our predecessor Pius V did when after the Council of Trent he made obligatory the missal that was reformed under his authority".

The misrepresentations in this last statement are further testament to Paul VI's duplicity. First, Pius V did not reform the Roman missal. With the authority of *Trent*, he canonised—that is *codified*—the mode in which Mass had been offered for a thousand years, fixing it irreformably (*Quo primum*, July 14<sup>th</sup>, 1570). Secondly, when Paul VI instituted his rite he did the very opposite of what Pius V had done: he introduced novelty. He breached, moreover, the Church's explicit *monitum* against doing so, incurring

thereby an anathema imposed by *Trent* and another invoked by Pius V on anyone, *including a pope*, who would seek to alter the form in which Mass is to be offered. Thirdly, the assertion that Archbishop Lefebvre's refusal of the 'new Mass' was for sentimental reasons was a lie.

The Archbishop had tried on a number of occasions to see the Pope but had been rebuffed by Cardinal Villot. It is worth reading the account of the interchange which occurred when, at last, on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 1976 the Pope granted the Archbishop an audience. This is the report reproduced in the biography of the Archbishop by Bishop Bernard Tissier de Mallerais.<sup>59</sup>

Marcel Lefebvre wrote [to the Pope] a brief request for an audience: 'I did not intend to act against the Church and still less to offend Your Holiness; I am sorry if Your Holiness has been hurt by anything I have said or written'.

Paul VI was shaken and telephoned Cardinal Villot, the Secretary of State. He feared that Paul, who was impressionable, might let himself give in. In the end, the Cardinal insisted: 'Your Holiness cannot receive him without a witness... Take Benelli'. [Cf. Peter Hebblethwaite, *Pablo VI*, 553]

On September 11<sup>th</sup> in a deserted Castel Gandolfo, Archbishop Lefebvre was received by Paul at 10.30 A.M. Archbishop Benelli was already in the Pope's office. He did not utter a word but merely watched... more Montini than Lefebvre.

'You condemn me,' Paul VI began nervously, 'I am a modernist, a Protestant. It's intolerable! You are doing wicked

---

<sup>59</sup> Taken from the Archbishop's recollections with an interpolation from Peter Hebblethwaite's book on Paul VI. Cf. *The Biography Marcel Lefebvre*, op. cit., pp. 491-2.



work.’ The Archbishop said he sensed that the Holy Father felt personally attacked.

‘So then,’ Paul VI finished up saying, ‘now. Talk.’

‘Most Holy Father, I am not the ‘leader of the traditionalists’, but a bishop who like many faithful and priests is torn, wishing to keep the Faith and also to be submissive to you. Now, we see that the direction taken since the Council distances us from our predecessors. The nuns who dress in lay clothes are accepted, but the sisters that I saw two days ago are reduced to the lay state and the bishop has been five times to ask them to abandon their habits. Similarly, priests who are faithful to the catechism of all time and to the Mass of their ordination are kicked out onto the streets; and those who are no longer like priests are accepted.’

‘This is intolerable. You are refusing to do what the Council asked for.’

‘I’m carrying on what I have always done. For thirty years I worked to train priests and suddenly I’m suspended.’

‘Because you did not want to accept the changes, the Council.’

‘Exactly! Look at the fruits: empty seminaries, and with us thirty-five vocations, in spite of the difficulties.’

‘Why do you not accept the Council?’ You signed the decrees.’

‘There were two that I did not sign.’

‘Yes, two, religious liberty and *Gaudium et Spes*.’

...

‘And why not religious liberty?’

‘It contains passages that are word for word contrary to what was taught by Gregory XVI and Pius IX.’

‘Let’s leave that aside! We are not here to discuss theology.’ (I thought to myself, this is unbelievable.) ‘You have no right to oppose the Council; you are a scandal for the Church, you destroy the Church. It is horrible, you raise up Christians against

the Pope and against the Council. Do you feel nothing in your conscience that condemns you?

‘Nothing at all.’

‘You are irresponsible.’

‘I know I am continuing the Church. I train good priests.’

‘That is not true, you make priests against the Pope. You make them sign an oath against the Pope.’

‘I do what?’

(On hearing this incredible allegation, I put my head in my hands.) ... ‘Most Holy Father, how can you say such a thing to me? I have them sign an oath against the Pope! Can you show me a copy of this oath?’

He was amazed. He was so convinced of the truth of what Cardinal Villot—probably—had told him. He continued:

‘You condemn the Pope! What orders will you give me? What must I do? Hand in my resignation and then you can take my place?’

‘Ah! ... Most Holy Father, don’t say things like that. No, no, no! Let me carry on. You have the solution in your hands. You only need say one thing to the bishops: ‘Welcome with understanding these groups of faithful who hold to Tradition, the Mass, the sacraments and the catechism of all time; give them places to worship.’ These groups will be the Church, you will find vocations among them and they will be the best in the Church. The bishops will see it. Leave me my seminary. Let me carry out this experiment of Tradition. I truly want to have normal relations with the Holy See, through a commission that you could name which would come to the seminary. But obviously, we will keep on going; we want to continue this experiment of Tradition.’

‘Very well. I’ll think about it, pray, and consult with the Congregation of the Consistory and the Curia. These are difficult problems. I will write to you. Let us pray together.’

We prayed a *Pater Noster*, *Veni Sancte Spiritus* and *Ave Maria*. He led to the adjoining room, walking with difficulty.

‘Dialogue is impossible,’ he concluded, and then he left me.

Paul VI rejected the Archbishop’s plea formally on October 11<sup>th</sup>, invoking in his support the false understanding of tradition that the bishops of Vatican II had uttered in *Dei Verbum* n. 8, as to which see *The Church of Paul VI and of John Paul II* above. The Pope’s refusal to uphold his own moral teaching in *Humanae Vitae* in the celebrated *Washington Case* confirms his duplicity.<sup>60</sup>

#### *Who is the Second?*

Despite his systematic departures from Catholic principle, **John Paul II** can, we think, be excluded. Papa Wojtyła was not so much devious as philosophically incompetent, his ineptitude disposing him to embrace the misconception of the Church’s reality vaunted by the bishops of Vatican II and the syncretism the Council promoted. While he pronounced innumerable *material* heresies, he would insist that his teaching was in conformity with the Church’s tradition. That the ‘tradition’ he was relying on was not that of the Catholic Church but of her Counterfeit—expressed in *Dei Verbum* n. 8—would seem to relieve him of a degree of subjective guilt. His ‘excommunication’ of Archbishop Lefebvre, Bishop de Castro Mayer and the newly consecrated bishops of the Society of St Pius X was founded on that

---

<sup>60</sup> Reported in George Weigel, *The Courage to be Catholic*, New York, 2002, pp. 68 et seq.

false understanding of tradition, aided by a misunderstanding of the provisions of the new Code of Canon Law.<sup>61</sup>

Despite the scandals in religious syncretism in which John Paul II engaged, he demonstrated adherence to Catholic principle in moral matters, such as contraception and artificially induced abortion, and he reproved Catholic lawyers cooperating in the procuring of divorces. He upheld Catholic theological principle in his *motu proprio* *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis* on the inadmissibility of admission of women to the priesthood and in other documents such as his apostolic exhortation on St Joseph on August 15<sup>th</sup>, 1989, the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Leo XIII's encyclical, *Quamquam pluries*.

Though **Benedict XVI** shared in the materialism and subjectivism of his predecessor, his reign as Pope differs dramatically from that of John Paul II.

Benedict came to regret, it would seem, the isolation of Archbishop Lefebvre over his consecration of bishops without a papal mandate expressed in the apostolic letter *Ecclesia Dei* (July 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1988), to the drafting of which he, as head of the *Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith*, had almost certainly contributed. The realisation of the document's theological flaws may have moved him to lift

---

<sup>61</sup> This issue is dealt with *in extenso* in the paper *The Status of the Novus Ordo Missae* at [https://www.superflumina.org/PDF\\_files/status-novus-ordo.pdf](https://www.superflumina.org/PDF_files/status-novus-ordo.pdf) published by the author in February, 2021. The reader should study particularly the material under the heading 'Ecclesia Dei'.

the ‘excommunications’. In similar fashion, he seems to have regretted the slide from orthodoxy the Council had precipitated, though he did not reside in the least from the revolution it had accomplished.<sup>62</sup> The liberal ‘faithful’ criticised Benedict for his departures from the Council’s protocols, characterising him as ‘conservative’, and many of the faithful seemed convinced his election signaled a return to orthodoxy, a conviction rocked by his resignation. As we will see, this event revealed a more invidious side to the Pope.

In a recent paper Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò has remarked the philosophical interplay between Pope Benedict’s resignation and the election of Jorge Mario Bergoglio in his place, how their respective acts fulfilled two of the Hegelian protocols (*thesis, antithesis, synthesis*) which underlie the modernist heresy.<sup>63</sup> He noted (i) that as early as 1970, the young Fr Ratzinger had envisaged, in discussions with the heterodox Fr Karl Rahner, the concepts of a ‘pope emeritus’ and of a collegial, or shared, papacy; and (ii), that Papa Ratzinger had during his reign confided to a trusted assistant on a number of occasions his intention of retiring to private life.

These revelations argue against the view that his abandonment of the office of Father of all the faithful merely demonstrated weakness and lack of faith in divine

---

<sup>62</sup> As in his last Address to the clergy of Rome above.

<sup>63</sup> *Secret Letters shed new light on Benedict’s Resignation, ‘pope emeritus’ title*, November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2024, available on the internet.

help. They infer a positive intention to overturn Christ's mandate reposing authority to rule and guide His Church in one man, St Peter (and his successors), and to contrive the sharing of that authority in furtherance of Vatican II's programs of collegiality and false ecumenism.

The Council's hint at the possibility of reducing the authority of the Pope was, as Archbishop Viganò notes, mentioned in John Paul II's encyclical *Ut Unum Sint* (1995). In a recent document of the "Dicastery for Promoting Christian Unity" its authors, using an ambivalence characteristic of modernism, suggested overturning the solemn pronouncement of the 1870 *Vatican Council* (which confirmed the Catholic Church's teaching from her inception) in the following terms—

"We teach and declare that the Roman Church, by the disposition of the Lord, holds the sovereignty of ordinary power over all others, and that this power of jurisdiction on the part of the Roman Pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate; and with respect to this the pastors and the faithful of whatever rite and dignity, both as separated individuals and together are bound by the duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, not only in things which pertain to faith and morals, but also in those which pertain to the discipline and government of the Church... spread over the whole world, so that the Church of Christ, protected not only by the Roman Pontiff, but by the unity of communion as well as of the profession of the same faith is one flock under the one highest shepherd. This is the doctrine of Catholic truth from which no one can deviate and keep his faith and salvation." Dz. 1827: DS 3060

The bishops of Vatican II had, through the imposition of the device of the bishops' conference, diminished individual episcopal authority. Paul VI sought to buttress this (1) by imposing, in 1966 (motu proprio *Ecclesiae Sanctae*), a retiring age on bishops, to produce the novelty of the 'bishop emeritus', and (2) in 1970 (motu proprio *Ingravescentem Aetatem*) by depriving the cardinals of their Curial functions after age 75 and of their elective functions after age 80. These initiatives derogated from the authority and dignity Christ bestowed on the fulness of the priesthood and removed the benefit of the practical wisdom the bishops and cardinals had to offer.<sup>64</sup> Papa Ratzinger's creation, the 'pope emeritus', reveals similar motivation. When, on February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013 in the Declaration *Non solum propter* he announced his decision to resign, he repeated Paul VI's expression '*ingravescente aetate*'.<sup>65</sup> An impartial observer would be entitled to conclude that in each document the author had used the expression to hide another *agendum*.<sup>66</sup>

Thus, it is reasonable to argue that when Cardinal Ratzinger's accepted the office of Pope he did so with the

---

<sup>64</sup> Cardinal Ottaviani said that the Pope's action was "an act committed in contempt of tradition that is centuries old" and that he was "throwing overboard the bulk of his expert and gifted counsellors". (according to Alfred Friendly Jr., *New York Times*, 27.11.1970)

<sup>65</sup> 'With increasing age', here in ablative absolute form. In typical modernist fashion its author implies, *non sequitur*, that debility of body entails debility of mind.

<sup>66</sup> This is not the only instance of Ratzinger emulating Montini: like Paul VI he neglected to feature the triple tiara in his coat of arms.

mental reservation that he would abandon the office and its responsibilities at will. There have been papal resignations in the past<sup>67</sup> but Archbishop Viganò is right to say that Ratzinger's involved a modality unique in the Church's history.

All of the above is premised on the fact that Pope Benedict's resignation was valid. But there is a problem with the resignation which turns on the metaphysical distinction between the *essence* (nature) of a thing and its *powers*.<sup>68</sup> With respect to the papacy these two elements are reflected in the terms *munus* and *ministerium*. A study of *Non solum propter* reveals that Benedict purported to resign not the office (*munus*) but—

“the ministry (*ministerium*) of the Bishop of Rome, of the Successor of St Peter, entrusted to me through the hands of the cardinals...”

---

<sup>67</sup> St Pontian resigned (235) after his exile to the salt mines in Sardinia by Maximinus Thrax to enable a successor to be elected. St Silverius was deposed by the Byzantine Empress, Theodora, and exiled to the island of Palmaria. The clergy of Rome decided he was *functus officio* and elected Pope Virgilius in his place in March 537. Benedict IX's reign had a troubled history, resigning the papacy twice, once in 1045 for venal reasons and, on his return, in 1048 after King Henry III of Germany removed him. St Celestine V, an 84 year old Benedictine monk renowned for holiness, accepted election (in July, 1294) to resolve a deadlock between cardinal electors. He resigned in the December to get away from their scheming. Gregory XII was the legitimate Pope during the Great Western Schism, but agreed to resign along with the two anti-popes (in 1415) during the *Council of Constance* so a Pope, Martin V, could be elected who would meet the expectations of the contesting parties.

<sup>68</sup> There is a determinate proportionality in material things of their *natures, powers, acts and ends*. *Summa Contra Gentiles* III, Ch 129, [4]



Canon 188 of the 1983 *Code of Canon Law* is clear:

A resignation which is made as a result of grave fear unjustly inflicted, or of deceit, or of substantial error, or of simony, is invalid by virtue of the law itself.

Since it was uncertain in its expression, the resignation contained substantial error and was *eo ipso* invalid.<sup>69</sup>

Archbishop Viganò mentions another aspect of the business. The International Monetary Fund had suspended the operation of the SWIFT system preventing the passage of money into or out of the Vatican, a suspension which was lifted immediately Pope Benedict issued his Declaration. This intrusion of a secular influence on the workings of the Vatican bears the hallmark of intimidation, “of a grave fear unjustly inflicted” which, if borne out by objective evidence, adds another ground for the resignation’s invalidity.

Now, if Pope Benedict’s resignation was invalid, the sentence in his Declaration is ineffectual which claims—  
“that from the twenty-eighth day of February 2013, at the twentieth hour, the see of Rome, the See of St. Peter, will be vacant; and I declare that a Conclave to select a new highest pontiff needs to be convoked by those to whom the duty belongs”—

He remained Pope and, since the Church’s two thousand years of tradition is eloquent of the truth that there can be but one Pope at a time, the conclave and election of his

---

<sup>69</sup> Again (yet again!), Ratzinger’s error resulted from the failure to make a necessary distinction.

‘successor’ was void. Accordingly, as Archbishop Viganò has remarked, after February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2013 and the election of his ‘successor’,

“the Emeritus was Pope but did not exercise the papacy, while Bergoglio *acted* as Pope without being Pope.”

There is something else: since Pope Benedict’s death on December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2022, the See of Rome has been vacant.

***This analysis is argumentative, not determinative.***

Neither the writer nor anyone but God’s Holy Church has authority to determine the issue. Yet, the argument is supported by a logical principle quoted by St Thomas: *contra factum non fit argumentum* - no argument avails against a fact. It is *a fact* that Jorge Mario Bergoglio is engaged, and has been since his election, in teaching error in faith and morals.<sup>70</sup> Our Lord Jesus Christ gave His Church (and His faithful) a guarantee when He said this:

“And I say to thee: that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.” *Matt. 16: 18, 19*

But if a duly appointed Pope teaches error in faith and morals, the gates of hell *have prevailed* against the Church! It seems rational to conclude, then, that it is

---

<sup>70</sup> See the paper *Call for the Resignation of Pope Francis* issued by a group of faithful Catholics published on May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2024 at <https://rorate-caeli.blogspot.com/2024/05/major-statement-crimes-and-heresies-of.html>

impossible that he could be Pope; that the Cardinals' election of Jorge Mario Bergoglio was void.

Yet the Church has endorsed him as Pope!<sup>71</sup> How are clergy and faithful to resolve the dilemma? Again the answer is to be found in the wisdom of St Thomas who provides the essential principle: *distinguendam est* – 'it is necessary to distinguish'.

The Church distinguishes law from fact. As a matter of fact (*de facto*) Bergoglio may not be - may never have been - Pope. As a matter of law (*de jure*), however, he is Pope and, until the Church pronounces otherwise, the faithful are entitled to rely on the law. Thus every priest is entitled to include Francis in the prayer he offers for the Pope in the Canon of Holy Mass, and the faithful are entitled to pray for him as Pope. Whatever the reality, their heartfelt prayers may yet assist in converting him for no prayer is ever wasted.

Regrettably, in the battle between the Church and her counterfeit the latter is, and has been since the reign of Paul VI, in the ascendant. Accordingly, the faithful cannot hope to have the issue resolved until the Cardinals elect a Pope who realises that a state of war, of holy war, exists between the two entities and that he must resolve it in Christ's favour and against the devil. Then, and only then,

---

<sup>71</sup> Because, we argue, of the overbearing influence in the Church's operations of the heterodox *Church of Vatican II*, an inevitable effect of confusion of operations of the Counterfeit with those of the Church.

will Christ's Church be able to resume the exclusive management of her affairs.

*Nota bene:* a great deal of nonsense has been written of the consequences that would flow if the Church was to determine that Jorge Mario Bergoglio was never Pope, including assertions that the bishops he has approved are not authentic bishops, that the cardinals he has appointed are invalidly appointed and, (God save us!) that the Church would be revealed as defectable. Its authors ought to study the Church's long established tradition in canon law that where authorization is lacking the Church supplies, as evidenced by the following in the 1983 *Code*.

*Canon 144*

§ 1 In common error, whether of fact or of law, and in positive and probable doubt, whether of law or of fact, the Church supplies executive power of governance for both the external and the internal forum.

What, then, is to be said of **Pope Francis**, the former Archbishop of Buenos Aires, Jorge Mario Cardinal Bergoglio? Does he qualify, in the face of the opposition offered by Benedict, as the second 'worm ridden' pope? If he is not Pope the question does not arise and, for the reasons advanced, that is the position we take here.

### *The Two Worm-ridden Popes*

Who, then, are at the two worm ridden popes? Or - better question - with Paul VI fulfilling the requirements for the first nomination, who is the best fit for the second? An extrinsic fact which is neither evidence nor proof may assist in a tentative conclusion. Of the four Popes we have considered, the end of the effective reign of two of them

featured extraordinary meteorological phenomena. The death of Paul VI on August 6<sup>th</sup>, 1978, the fourteenth anniversary of his first, and problematic, encyclical *Ecclesiam Suam*, was marked by a tempest of thunder, rain and high winds such as had seldom been seen in Rome.<sup>72</sup> On the evening of the day of the announcement by Benedict XVI of his intention to resign from the papacy, February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2013, in filthy weather, lightning struck the dome of St Peter's Basilica twice.<sup>73</sup>

### *Consolation for the Catholic Faithful?*

Given the experience of some 120 years of the Catholic Church's sufferings at the hands of heretics and schismatics since Our Blessed Lady's appearance at La Salette, her prophecies, if correctly reported, may offer the Catholic faithful some hope as the end of the first quarter of the 21<sup>st</sup> century approaches. If the anti-Christ is already seated on the throne of Peter, if the two 'worm-ridden' popes have already appeared, the next Pope may offer a return to some sort of sanity in the Catholic Church and restoration to the rightful position of mistress in her own house. At the very least this will require the Pope who replaces Bergoglio to acknowledge a distinction between the Church that Christ founded and her counterfeit, the *Church of Vatican II*.

---

<sup>72</sup> According to Leonard Latkovski M.A., O.S.J. in his Preface to Wigand Siebel, *The Program of Pope John Paul II, A Study of the encyclical Redemptor Hominis* (translated by Latkovski from the German), 1980. Cf. <http://www.the-pope.com/prog-jp2.html>

<sup>73</sup> The internet has videos of them. Why two strikes? St John of the Cross teaches "God ordains all", and God does nothing in vain.

The groundwork for this return has already been laid by the opposition to Vatican II and to the mindset of Paul VI and John Paul II by the late Archbishop Lefebvre carried on by the Society he established and the religious and faithful who have associated themselves with its work. It is the Archbishop's much-criticised initiative in 1988 of consecrating, with Bishop Antonio de Castro Mayer, bishops to ensure the ordination of priests to celebrate Mass in the millennial Roman rite, that has enabled the *Society of St Pius X* to grow as it has. It was his initiative, moreover, that precipitated the reaction which produced within *the Church of Vatican II* the *Priestly Society of St Peter* and other associations of priests dedicated to offering Mass in the millennial rite.

For all Pope Benedict's shortcomings, then, his lifting the 'excommunications' not only removed much of the opposition to Archbishop Lefebvre's initiative among the faithful but restored a measure of the justice due to him.

Despite the ravaging of Christ's Church and of the faith that flowed from the revolution of the Second Vatican Council, the Holy Spirit remains her soul. His program to expose the counterfeit Church for its imposture, and to place on the throne of Peter a Pope unaffected by its modernist poison, will come to pass in the fulness of time.

***Magna est Veritas et Praevalebit!***

---