

Chapter 6

The Motive Takes Hold

Around 1948, Pope Pius XII, at the request of the staunchly orthodox Cardinal Ruffini, considered calling a general Council and even spent a few years making the necessary preparations. There is evidence that progressive elements in Rome eventually dissuaded Pius XII from bringing it to realization since this Council showed definite signs of being in line with *Humani Generis* and its condemnation of Modernist errors. Like this great 1950 encyclical, the proposed Council of Pius XII would combat “false opinions which threaten to undermine the foundations of Catholic doctrine.”¹²⁰

At the same time, the “errors of Russia” to which the Virgin of Fatima referred were penetrating the Church Herself. Various Catholic religious orders were being infiltrated. For example, the so-called “Catholic Priest Worker” movement was so clearly infiltrated by Communists that Pius XII called for an end to it in the 1950’s.

Tragically, Pius XII became convinced that he was too advanced in years to shoulder the momentous task of a Council to combat the swelling ranks of the Church’s enemies, and he resigned himself to the decision that “this will be for my successor.”¹²¹ Pope Pius XII died on October 9, 1958.

And now we have arrived very near to the critical year in our case. We have arrived at 1958, two years before 1960—the year in which the Third Secret was to be disclosed in accordance with the wishes of the Virgin of Fatima, as Sister Lucy had testified. Throughout the pontificate of Pius XII, the Holy Office, under the able leadership of Cardinal Ottaviani, maintained sound orthodoxy by keeping the wild horses of modernism firmly corralled. Many of today’s Modernist theologians disdainfully recount how they and their friends had been “muzzled” during this period.

Yet even Cardinal Ottaviani could not prevent what was to happen in 1958. A new type of Pope “whom the progressives believed to favor their cause”¹²² would ascend to the Pontifical Chair and would force a reluctant Ottaviani to remove the latch, open the corral and brace himself for the stampede. However, such a state of affairs was not unforeseen. At the news of the death of Pope Pius XII, the old Dom Lambert Beauduin, a friend of Roncalli’s (the future Pope John XXIII) confided to Father

¹²⁰ A full account of this fascinating history is found in *The Whole Truth About Fatima* - Vol. III, by Frère Michel de la Sainte Trinité, pp. 257-304.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 297.

¹²² Vicomte Leon de Poncins, *Freemasonry and the Vatican*, (Christian Book Club, Palmdale, California, 1968) p. 14.

Bouyer: "If they elect Roncalli, everything would be saved; he would be capable of calling a council and of consecrating ecumenism."¹²³

At this point in our presentation it must be emphasized, especially for the non-Catholic reader, that the changes in the basic orientation of the Church we are about to discuss are totally unprecedented and represent perhaps the worst crisis in Her history. A careful study of what follows will make clear why the Message of Fatima, with its call for the consecration and *conversion* of Russia as the harbinger of world peace, has become unacceptable to the politically correct, liberalized churchmen of the last fifty years. These unprecedented changes in the Catholic Church are no boon, but a great detriment, to non-Catholics, since the result of the Church's "updating" has included not merely the clerical scandals we now see, but a failure of the human element of the Church to perform an action—the solemn consecration of Russia—that would benefit the whole of mankind.

A Council is Called as the Message of Fatima Comes Under Attack

And so it happened just as Dom Lambert foretold. Roncalli was elected and, as Pope John XXIII, called a Council and consecrated ecumenism. The "revolution in tiara and cope" predicted by the *Alta Vendita* was underway.

And one of the first acts of the revolution was to dispense with the Third Secret of Fatima. Contrary to the expectations of the whole world, on February 8, 1960 (just over a year after the Council had been called), the Vatican issued the following anonymous announcement through the A.N.I. press agency:

Vatican City, February 8, 1960 (A.N.I.) – It is probable that the "Secret of Fatima" will never be made public. In Vatican circles highly worthy of belief, they have just declared to the representative of United Press International that it is most likely the letter will never be opened, in which Sister Lucy wrote down the words which the Virgin Mary addressed to the three shepherds of the Cova da Iria ... It is most probable that the "Secret of Fatima" will remain forever under absolute seal.

And in the same communiqué we find the first direct attack from Vatican sources on the credibility of the Message of Fatima as a whole:

Although the Church recognizes the Fatima apparitions, She does not pledge Herself to guarantee the veracity of the words which the three shepherds claim to have heard from Our Lady.

Claim to have heard? Could there be any doubt about the veracity of their testimony after the Miracle of the Sun? Could there be any

¹²³ L. Bouyer, *Dom Lambert Beauduin, a Man of the Church*, Casterman, 1964, pp. 180-181, quoted by Father Didier Bonnetterre in *The Liturgical Movement*, Ed. Fideliter, 1980, p. 119.

question that they had been given an authentic prophecy from Heaven in view of the complete fulfillment of every prediction in the Message thus far—from the imminent end of World War I, to the spread of Russia's errors, to World War II and the election of Pope Pius XI?

This first public attack on the Message of Fatima from within the Vatican apparatus comes in 1960, as the Vatican begins to pursue a new orientation of the Church that will arise (as we shall soon see) at the Second Vatican Council. Consider these developments surrounding the February 8, 1960 communiqué:

- The communiqué publicly questions the veracity of Lucy, Jacinta, and Francisco.
- From 1960 forward, Sister Lucy is silenced on orders of the Vatican apparatus,¹²⁴ so she could not defend herself from the implied accusation that her testimony is unreliable.
- The documents in the official Fatima archives, which Father Alonso will compile between 1965 and 1976, (more than 5,000 documents in 24 volumes) will be barred from publication, even though these documents confirm that the Fatima prophecies in the first two parts of the Secret (the election of Pope Pius XI, the coming of World War

¹²⁴ Jesuit Father Aparicio was Sister Lucy's confessor and spiritual director from 1926 to 1938. Then he was sent to Brazil as a missionary and corresponded with Sister Lucy over the years. In 1950 he returned to Portugal for a short while and visited Sister Lucy both in 1950 and in 1951 without difficulty. Father Aparicio testified that in August 1960, during a month-long visit to Portugal, he was not allowed to speak to Sister Lucy: "I have not been able to speak to Sister Lucy because the Archbishop could not give the permission to meet her. The *conditions of isolation in which she finds herself have been imposed by the Holy See*. Consequently, no one may speak to her without a licence from Rome. The Archbishop has only a very limited number of those licences." (*Fatima: Tragedy and Triumph*, Immaculate Heart Publications, 1994, pp. 33-34.)

The situation had not changed since then until her death on February 13, 2005. On January 16, 1983 Father Joseph de Sainte-Marie, O.C. wrote to the eminent Catholic layman Hamish Fraser to advise that: "Moreover, I remind you—she [Sister Lucy] herself reminded me recently in a request that I had addressed to her—that Sister Lucia [Lucy] cannot speak to anyone on the question of the apparitions without the express permission of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith or of the Holy Father himself." (*The Fatima Crusader*, No. 13-14, p. 13.) And on March 19, 1983 Sister Lucy told the Papal Nuncio to Portugal, Most Reverend Sante Portalupi, that she had not been able to comment earlier on the inadequacy of the 1982 consecration ceremony (of the world, not Russia) because the Holy See had not given her permission to speak: "The Consecration of Russia has not been made as Our Lady demanded. I could not say so [before] because I did not have permission of the Holy See." (*Ibid.*, p. 3; and *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue 16, September-October 1984, pp. 22ff, reprinting the article by Father Pierre Caillon in *Fidelite Catholique*, first printed in 1983.)

On February 19, 1990, Msgr. A. Duarte de Almeida, chaplain to the Coimbra Carmel, stated the following: "in order to meet Sister Lucy, it is necessary to obtain Cardinal Ratzinger's permission." (In David Boyce, "Fatima Inquest - August 1990", *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue 35, Winter 1990-1991, p. 13.)

As recently as the purported "interview" of Sister Lucy by Msgr. Bertone on November 17, 2001, Msgr. Bertone admitted (in his communiqué concerning the interview) that it had been conducted with the *consent* of Cardinal Ratzinger. Thus, as recently as 2001 even a high-ranking Vatican prelate needed the Holy See's permission to speak with Sister Lucy.

II, the spread of Communism throughout the world, etc.) had been revealed privately by Sister Lucy long before their fulfillment, and that her testimony was utterly accurate and reliable.

A veritable plot against Fatima had begun. And the motive for the plot—a desire to shift the orientation of the Church away from the Catholic certitudes of the Message of Fatima and toward an “enlightened” accommodation towards the world—would begin in earnest with the commencement of the Second Vatican Council on October 11, 1962. We recall again the words of Sister Lucy that Our Lady wished the Third Secret to be released in 1960 because it “will be clearer (*mais claro*) then.” Now it would become very clear indeed.

The “Errors of Russia” Infiltrate the Church

First, just before the Council’s commencement, there would be another betrayal of the Message of Fatima, a sign of many unprecedented things to come. In the spring of 1962, in Metz, France, Cardinal Eugene Tisserant had a meeting with none other than Metropolitan Nikodim of the Russian Orthodox Church—a KGB operative, as were the other Orthodox prelates. At this meeting Tisserant and Nikodim negotiated what came to be known as the Metz Pact, or more popularly, the Vatican-Moscow Agreement.¹²⁵ The existence of the Vatican-Moscow Agreement is an irrefutable historical fact attested to in all of its details by Monsignor Roche, who was Cardinal Tisserant’s personal secretary. Moreover, since the first edition of this book appeared, the renowned Italian journalist Andrea Tornielli has published a biography of Pope Paul VI in which we learn that “what many considered a conspiracy theory was true: there was indeed a secret agreement, led by Cardinal Tisserant, between the Soviet Union and the papacy (under Pope John XXIII) in 1962—an agreement which Pope Paul VI (‘Montini’) also enforced. In a note of November 15, 1965, in fact, Paul VI (Montini) explicitly mentions among ‘the commitments of the Council’ also that of ‘not mentioning Communism (1962).’”¹²⁶

In substance, the agreement was as follows: Pope John XXIII, according to his fond wish, would be “favored” by the attendance of two Russian Orthodox observers at the Council. In return, the Catholic Church would agree that the Second Vatican Council would refrain from any condemnation of Soviet Communism or Soviet Russia. In essence, the Council would compromise the moral liberty of the Catholic Church by pretending that the most systematized form of human evil in human history did not exist—even though, at the very moment the Council

¹²⁵ See Jean Madiran, “The Vatican-Moscow Agreement”, *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue 16, September-October, 1984, p. 5. Also articles on pages 4, 7, and 11 in *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue 17, February-April, 1985. See also Atila Sinke Guimarães, “The Metz Pact”, *Catholic Family News*, September 2001.

¹²⁶ Giacomo Galeazzi, “Paoli VI, patto segreto con l’Urss” (“Paul VI, Secret Pact with USSR”), *La Stampa*, July 6, 2009, accessible online at http://newrassegna.camera.it/chiosco_new/pagweb/immagineFrame.asp?comeFrom=search¤tArticle=MGOJJ

opened, the Soviets were persecuting, imprisoning and murdering millions of Catholics.

Her liberty thus constrained in a bargain with Communists, the Council failed even to mention Communism. By this failure the Council departed from the teaching of Pope Leo XIII, Blessed Pius IX, Saint Pius X and also Pope Pius XI, who reminded the Church that we could not refrain from condemning this incomparable evil. As he said in *Divini Redemptoris*,

This all too imminent danger, venerable brethren, as you have already surmised is Bolshevistic and atheistic Communism which aims at upsetting the social order and undermining the very foundations of Christian civilization. In the face of such a threat the Catholic Church *could not and does not remain silent*. This Apostolic See above all has *not refrained from raising its voice* for it knows that its proper and special mission is to defend truth, justice and all those eternal values which Communism ignores or attacks.¹²⁷

And yet the Council would say not one word about Soviet Communism, but would instead begin a “dialogue” with the very forces the Church once opposed.

Why did this happen? It was surely no “coincidence” that the Council’s silence about Communism synchronized perfectly with the Communist infiltration of the Catholic Church which, as we showed in a previous chapter, had been revealed just before Vatican II by key witnesses with no motive to lie (Dodd, Hyde, Golitsyn, Mitrokhin and others). Even without such testimonies, our common sense should tell us that the forces of Communism (working alongside those of Freemasonry) would inevitably attempt to destroy the Catholic Church from within. Satan is intelligent enough to know that the Catholic Church is the one citadel he must storm in his effort to conquer the whole world for the kingdom of darkness.

This, then, was the state of affairs in the Church at the very moment that the Second Vatican Council was wrongly constrained to observe its shameful silence on the evil of Communism. And, needless to say, under the Vatican-Moscow Agreement, the Consecration of Soviet Russia to the Immaculate Heart by the Council Fathers, in order to bring about its conversion, would be absolutely out of the question. This early shift toward a new orientation of the Church, which the Council would accelerate in a most dramatic fashion, was already in conflict with the Message of Fatima.

And so it has been ever since the meeting in Metz, which expanded the pursuit of *Ostpolitik*, the policy implemented by the Vatican Secretary of State under which the Church has ceased all condemnation and opposition to Communist regimes in favor of “dialogue” and

¹²⁷ Pope Pius XI, *Divini Redemptoris*, Encyclical on Atheistic Communism, March 19, 1937. See also quotation on pages 68-69 referenced by footnote 164 of this chapter.

“quiet diplomacy”—a policy which to this day has silenced the Vatican concerning the vicious persecution of the Church in Red China and other communist regimes, including Cuba, where the Vatican has also remained silent about continuing communist repression of the Church.

Thus on October 12, 1962, two representative priests of the Orthodox church debarked from a plane at Fiumicino Airport and attended the Second Vatican Council. The Council began with Orthodox observers watching its proceedings, making sure that the Vatican-Moscow Agreement was observed. The written intervention of 450 Council Fathers against Communism was mysteriously “lost” after being delivered to the Secretariat of the Council, and Council Fathers who stood up to denounce Communism were politely told to sit down and be quiet.¹²⁸

The Church’s own leaders had lowered the drawbridge to the Communists, at the same time Communists and Freemasons were attempting to destroy Her from within by (to recall the predictions of Bella Dodd):

- encouraging “the promotion of a pseudo-religion: something that resembled Catholicism but was not the real thing,”
- labelling “the ‘Church of the past’ as being oppressive, authoritarian, full of prejudices, arrogant in claiming to be the sole possessor of truth, and responsible for the divisions of religious bodies throughout the centuries,”
- shaming Church leaders into “an ‘openness to the world,’ and to a more flexible attitude toward all religions and philosophies.”

And finally, as Dodd predicted, “The Communists would then exploit this openness in order to undermine the Church.”

This grand effort at subversion would involve, first and foremost, the breakthrough of Modernist “theology” at an ecumenical council—just as Canon Roca and the other illumines of Freemasonry had boasted.

The Neo-Modernists Triumph at Vatican II

On October 13, 1962, the day after the two Communist observers arrived at the Council, and on the very anniversary of the Miracle of the Sun at Fatima, the history of the Church and the world was profoundly changed by the smallest of events. Cardinal Liénart of France seized the microphone in a famous incident and demanded that the candidates proposed by the Roman Curia to chair the drafting commissions at the Council be set aside and that a new slate of candidates be drawn up. The demand was acceded to and the election postponed. When the election was finally held, liberals were elected to majorities and near-majorities on the conciliar commissions—many of them from among the very “innovators” decried by Pope Pius XII. The traditionally formulated preparatory schemas for the Council were discarded and

¹²⁸ A more complete account of this is found in Father Ralph Wiltgen, *The Rhine flows into the Tiber*, (New York: Hawthorne, 1967; Rockford, Illinois: TAN, 1985) pp. 272-278.

the Council began literally without a written agenda, leaving the way open for entirely new documents to be written by the liberals.

It is well known and superbly documented¹²⁹ that a clique of liberal *periti* (experts) and bishops then proceeded to hijack Vatican II with an agenda to remake the Church into their own image through the implementation of a “new theology”. Both critics and defenders of Vatican II are in agreement on this point. In his book *Vatican II Revisited*, Bishop Aloysius J. Wycislo (a rhapsodic advocate of the Vatican II revolution) declares with giddy enthusiasm that “theologians and biblical scholars who had been ‘under a cloud’ for years surfaced as *periti* (theological experts advising the bishops at the Council), and their post-Vatican II books and commentaries became popular reading.”¹³⁰

He noted that “Pope Pius XII’s encyclical *Humani Generis* had ... a devastating effect on the work of a number of pre-conciliar theologians”,¹³¹ and explains that “During the early preparation of the Council, those theologians (mainly French, with some German) whose activities had been restricted by Pope Pius XII, were still under a cloud. Pope John quietly lifted the ban affecting some of the most influential ones. Yet a number remained suspect to the officials of the Holy Office.”¹³²

On this point, the eyewitness testimony of Msgr. Rudolf Bandas, himself a conciliar *peritus*, is of decisive importance to our case:

No doubt good Pope John thought that these suspect theologians would rectify their ideas and perform a genuine service to the Church. But exactly the opposite happened. Supported by certain Rhine Council Fathers, and often acting in a manner positively boorish, they turned around and exclaimed: “Behold, we are named experts, our ideas stand approved.” ... When I entered my tribunal at the Council, on the first day of the fourth session, the first announcement, emanating from the Secretary of State, was the following: “No more *periti* will be appointed.” But it was too late. The great confusion was underway. It was already apparent that *neither Trent nor Vatican I nor any encyclical would be permitted to impede its advance*.¹³³

Indeed, Pope John XXIII himself was happy to announce that beginning with this Council the Church would, quite inexplicably, cease condemning error and stop all Her worrying about the dire condition of the world:

Nowadays ... the spouse of Christ prefers to make use of the

¹²⁹ E.g., *The Rhine flows into the Tiber* by Fr. Ralph Wiltgen; *Pope John’s Council* by Michael Davies (Angelus Press, Kansas City, Missouri); and even *Vatican II Revisited*, (see next footnote) which sings praises of the reform.

¹³⁰ Most Reverend Aloysius Wycislo S.J., *Vatican II Revisited, Reflections By One Who Was There*, (Alba House, Staten Island, New York) p. x.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

¹³² *Ibid.*, p. 27.

¹³³ *The Wanderer*, August 31, 1967, p. 7.

medicine of mercy rather than the arms of severity. She considers that She meets the needs of the present day by demonstrating the validity of Her teaching rather than by issuing condemnations. ... We feel we must disagree with those prophets of gloom, who are always forecasting disaster, as though the end of the world was at hand.¹³⁴

But John XXIII's optimism was quite at odds with the profound alarm over the state of the world to be seen in the many pronouncements of his immediate predecessors (not to mention in the Message of Fatima itself). Consider these few examples:

Pope St. Pius X:

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

Pope Pius XI:

With God and Jesus Christ excluded from political life, with authority derived not from God but from man, ... the chief reason of the distinction between ruler and subject has been eliminated. The result is that society is *tottering to its ruin* because it no longer has a secure and solid foundation [*Quas Primas*].

Pope Pius XII (*after* the end of WWII):

We are overwhelmed with sadness and anguish, seeing that the wickedness of perverse men has reached a degree of impiety that is unbelievable and *absolutely unknown in other times* [Letter of February 11, 1949].

Venerable brethren, you are well aware that almost the whole human race is today allowing itself to be driven into two opposing camps, for Christ or against Christ. *The human race is involved today in a supreme crisis*, which will issue in its salvation by Christ, or in its destruction [*Evangeli Praecones*, 1951].

To be sure, there would be countless battles at Vatican II between the International Group of Fathers who fought to uphold the dogmas of the Faith and Catholic Tradition, and the progressive Rhine group. Tragically, however, it was the liberal and Modernist element that prevailed, let loose by John XXIII's optimism that the truth would prevail of its own force without the aid of any medicinal condemnations by the Magisterium. Wycislo sings the praises of triumphant progressives such as Hans Küng, Karl Rahner, John Courtney Murray, Yves Congar, Henri de Lubac, Edward Schillebeeckx and Gregory Baum, who had

¹³⁴ *Council Daybook*, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C., Vol. 1, pp. 25, 27.

been considered suspect before the Council (for good reason) and are now the leading lights of post-Vatican II theology.¹³⁵

In effect, those whom Pope Pius XII considered unfit to be walking the streets of Catholicism were now in control of the town. And as if to crown their achievements, the *Oath Against Modernism* and the *Index of Forbidden Books* were both quietly suppressed shortly after the close of the Council—a decision Bishop Graber called “incomprehensible.”¹³⁶ St. Pius X had predicted correctly. Lack of vigilance in authority had provoked modernism to return with a vengeance.

Two Prominent Examples of “Rehabilitated” Neo-Modernists

Let us consider two examples of the “new” theologians who were let loose upon the Church to do their work of destruction: Dominique Chenu and Hans Küng.

Chenu was an advocate of the New Theology made famous by Henri de Lubac. Chenu was issued a condemnation for his progressive ideas in 1942 under Pope Pius XII.¹³⁷ His book *Une école de théologie* was placed on the *Index of Forbidden Books* and he lost his rectorship at the Dominican College of Le Saulchoir.¹³⁸ Father David Greenstock, writing in the 1950 *Thomist* against the New Theology of Chenu and de Lubac, explained the dangers of their system and the reason for their condemnation. Greenstock pointed out that the partisans of the New Theology reject Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophy in favor of modern philosophies. This must be done, they claim, in order to appeal to “modern man” who finds Thomistic philosophy “irrelevant”. The result is that Catholic theology is knocked off of its firm, philosophical foundation and shifted onto the fluid philosophical systems of the 20th Century, most of which are founded upon atheism and agnosticism.

Chenu also rejected the unchangeableness of Catholic doctrine, claiming that the source of all theology is not immutable dogma, but rather the vital life¹³⁹ of the Church in its members, which cannot be separated from history. Thus, strictly speaking, says Greenstock, Chenu held that “theology is the life of the members of the Church, rather than a series of conclusions drawn from revealed data with the aid of reason”—a principle that is slippery, imprecise and erroneous. As a result, Chenu held that religion can change with the times, and should change with the times, according to the demands of circumstances.

¹³⁵ *Vatican II Revisited, Reflections By One Who Was There*, pp. 27-34.

¹³⁶ Bishop Graber, *Athanasius and the Church of Our Time*, p. 54.

¹³⁷ Atila Sinke Guimarães, *Animus Delendi (The Desire to Destroy)*, (Tradition in Action, Los Angeles, California, 2001) p. 128. The exact title is *Animus Delendi - I* (the first of two books with this title).

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*

¹³⁹ “Vital life” seems to be just another term for the “Vital Imminence” condemned in Pope Pius X’s encyclical against Modernism, *Pascendi*. See p. 8, English translation by Newman Press.

Greenstock explained that the partisans of this New Theology are both unorthodox and deceitful. “The main contention of the partisans of this new movement,” wrote Greenstock, “is that theology, to remain alive, must move with the times. At the same time, they are very careful to repeat all the fundamental propositions of traditional theology, almost as if there was no intention of any attack against it. This is very true of such writers as Fathers de Lubac, Daniélou, Rahner, ... All of whom are undoubtedly at the very center of this movement.”¹⁴⁰

The eminent Dominican theologian, Father Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, writing in his famous 1946 essay “Where is the New Theology Taking Us?”¹⁴¹ demonstrated that the purveyors of the New Theology (Blondel, de Lubac, Chenu) pervert entirely the concept of the immutability of Truth. Thus, he warned, the New Theology can only lead in one direction—straight back to Modernism.

While all this was going on, Father Chenu and Father de Lubac were receiving behind-the-scenes protection and encouragement from Cardinal Suhard, Archbishop of Paris. Suhard told Chenu not to worry because “In twenty years, everyone in the Church will be talking like you.” As we can see, the Cardinal accurately predicted the invasion of the Church by neo-modernist thinking. Most churchmen today *do* talk like Chenu. In the early 1960s, Father Chenu was one of many radical theologians who were invited to Vatican II by Pope John XXIII. In the end, thanks to the Council’s progressivist orientation, Father Chenu saw many of his formally condemned theories advanced as part of Vatican II’s new teachings, especially within *Gaudium et Spes*. Chenu relates joyfully that the very points for which his work was condemned in 1942 are the same exact points now promoted by members of the hierarchy in the name of the Council.¹⁴²

As for Hans Küng, this “leading-light” of the post-conciliar period had worked closely at the Council with other radicals such as Congar, Ratzinger, Rahner and Schillebeeckx. In the 1970s, however, because Küng had gone “too far”, he was censored by the Vatican for certain heretical views, including the following: rejection of the Church’s infallibility; the claim that bishops do not receive their teaching authority from Christ; the suggestion that any baptized layperson has the power to confect the Holy Eucharist; the denial that Christ is “consubstantial” with the Father; the undermining of doctrines (unspecified) concerning the Virgin Mary.¹⁴³

It needs to be pointed out that these are only *some* of Küng’s heretical views, but they were the only ones mentioned within the Vatican’s

¹⁴⁰ Greenstock, David, “Thomism and the New Theology”, *The Thomist* (October, 1950). The entire article is well worth reading if one wishes to grasp the erroneous nature of the “New Theology”.

¹⁴¹ Published in the *Angelicum* in 1946. First English translation published in *Catholic Family News*, August 1997, “Where is the New Theology Taking Us?”

¹⁴² *Animus Delendi - I*, p. 129.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 146-149.

sanctions. Thus, in effect, the Vatican left Küng's other heterodox tenets untouched. For example, in one of his most famous books entitled *On Being a Christian*, Hans Küng:

- denies the Divinity of Christ (p. 130)
- dismisses the miracles of the Gospel (p. 233)
- denies the bodily resurrection of Jesus (p. 350)
- denies that Christ founded an institutional Church (p. 109)
- denies that the Mass is the re-presentation of Calvary (p. 323).¹⁴⁴

Küng has never retracted these unorthodox and heretical statements. Moreover, Küng has publicly called for a revision of Church teaching on issues such as papal infallibility, birth control, mandatory celibacy of priests, and women in the priesthood. Despite this blatant rejection of Church teaching, the only penalty that the Vatican ever inflicted against Küng was that he was “not allowed” to be considered a Catholic theologian, and as such, was not allowed to teach theology in a Catholic university. This “penalty” was circumvented when the University of Tübingen, Küng's home campus, retained Küng as a teaching professor and simply restructured part of the university so that Küng, a great celebrity, may continue teaching in that part of the university which is now chartered as a “secular” school.

Meanwhile, the Vatican has never condemned Küng as a heretic, never excommunicated him (as canon law provides), never ordered that his books be removed from libraries in Catholic seminaries and universities (where they are now found in abundance), never prevented him from being a guest-lecturer at Catholic institutions, never obstructed him from publishing articles in *Concilium* or other progressivist “Catholic” publications. Father Hans Küng is not even suspended. Rather, to this day, Küng remains a priest in good standing in the diocese of Basle, with no other canonical penalties leveled against him.

This means that a priest who continues to vomit his heretical poison upon anyone within reach is still allowed to conduct public liturgy, preach and give advice in the confessional. The Vatican's Congregation for the Clergy, under Cardinal Castrillón Hoyos, leaves him untouched. So, despite the feeble Vatican “condemnation”, Küng retains access to a very wide variety of influential “pipelines” to disseminate his poisonous doctrine throughout the Church. In fact, it is said that Hans Küng's “theological breakthroughs” on the nature of the Church are what provided the “theological foundation” that made possible the 1999 “Lutheran-Catholic” Accord.

Further, in 1998, the then Vatican Secretary of State Cardinal Sodano, who at that time was the most powerful Cardinal in the

¹⁴⁴ These observations are from Msgr. Kelly's book *The Battle for the American Church*, quoted by John Vennari in “Vatican Praises Purveyor of Heresy While it Hounds Apostle of Fatima”, *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue 57, Spring/Summer 1998, pp. 20-21.

Church, praised Küng in a public speech at the Lateran, in which he lauded Küng's "beautiful pages dedicated to the Christian mystery".¹⁴⁵ Cardinal Sodano also referred to Küng as "the German theologian" even though Küng had been supposedly stripped of that title. (This is the same Cardinal Angelo Sodano who was and is ultimately behind the ongoing persecution of Father Nicholas Gruner and his Fatima apostolate, as we shall see.)

Now, the 1942 condemnation that the Vatican leveled at Chenu was much more severe than what was hurled at Küng. Yet Chenu not only survived, but became a leading light of the Conciliar Church without ever changing his erroneous views. The same is true of Rahner, Congar, de Lubac and von Balthasar, all of whom were theologically suspect before the Council but came to enjoy great prestige—even though they never abandoned a single one of their heterodox opinions. Even the likes of Küng has reason to believe that whatever mild condemnation he suffers is just a temporary inconvenience, an annoying setback, a fate meted out to all true "prophets." Just as Chenu saw his heretical views eventually win the day thanks to a revolutionary Council, so likewise Küng may fill his breast with the hope that his errors will, in the not-so-distant future, eventually emerge as "mainstream" Catholicism *de facto*, even if not by any actual teaching of the authentic Magisterium, which could never bind the Church to such errors.

The Neo-Modernists Hail the "New" Church of Vatican II

With good reason, then, have progressivists such as Cardinal Suenens, Küng, Louis Bouyer and Yves Congar celebrated Vatican II as a Revolution, as the death of one era and the beginning of a new:

- Cardinal Suenens, who wielded great influence over Pope Paul VI, and who is a darling to those in the Church who call themselves "Charismatics", rejoiced that Vatican II marked the end of the Tridentine epoch and the end of the era of Vatican I.¹⁴⁶
- Hans Küng gloated, "Compared to the post-Tridentine epoch of the Counter-reformation, Vatican Council II represents in its fundamental characteristics, a 180 degree turn ... It is a new Church that has sprung up since Vatican II."¹⁴⁷
- Father Bouyer, a French *peritus* at the Council, exclaimed with relish that the anti-Protestant, anti-Modernist aspect of the Catholic Church "might as well die."¹⁴⁸
- Likewise, the Rome-based Jesuit magazine, *La Civiltà Cattolica*, also exclaimed joyfully, "With Vatican Council II, the Tridentine age was

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

¹⁴⁶ Cited from Guimarães, *Animus Delendi - I*, p. 60.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 61.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 59.

brought to a close for the Church.”¹⁴⁹

These statements are especially audacious when we consider that the Councils of Trent and Vatican I are dogmatic Councils whose teachings can never be changed, disregarded, or reinterpreted in the name of a “deeper understanding”. The First Vatican Council declared infallibly:

The meaning of Sacred Dogmas, which must always be preserved, is that which our Holy Mother the Church has determined. Never is it permissible to depart from this in the name of a deeper understanding.¹⁵⁰

Modernists, however, as Pope St. Pius X warned, do not accept anything as fixed or unchanging. Their chief principle is the “evolution of dogma”. They champion the notion that religion must change for the sake of changing times. In this respect, as in many others, the prime movers of Vatican II reveal themselves as men steeped in the error of Modernism.

Masons and Communists Rejoice

Along with the neo-modernists, the Masons and Communists have rejoiced at the Council’s outcome. Just as the authors of the *Permanent Instruction of the Alta Vendita* had hoped, just as the Communist infiltrators spoken of by Bella Dodd had hoped, the notions of liberal culture had finally won adherence among the major players in the Catholic hierarchy. Freemasons and Communists have celebrated the astounding turn of events wrought by the Council. They rejoice that Catholics have finally “seen the light,” and that many of their Masonic “principles” have been sanctioned by the Church.

For example, Yves Marsaudon of the Scottish Rite, in his book *Ecumenism Viewed by a Traditional Freemason* praised the ecumenism nurtured at Vatican II. He said:

Catholics ... must not forget that all roads lead to God. And they will have to accept that this courageous idea of freethinking, which we can really call a revolution, pouring forth from our Masonic lodges, has spread magnificently over the dome of St. Peter’s.¹⁵¹

Yves Marsaudon was delighted to add that “One can say that ecumenism is the legitimate son of Freemasonry.”¹⁵²

The post-Vatican II spirit of doubt and revolution obviously warmed the heart of French Freemason Jacques Mitterand, who wrote approvingly:

Something has changed within the Church, and replies given by the Pope to the most urgent questions such as priestly celibacy

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 62.

¹⁵⁰ Vatican I, Session III, Chap. IV, Faith and Reason.

¹⁵¹ Cited from Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, *Open Letter to Confused Catholics*, (Kansas City, Missouri: Angelus Press, 1995) pp. 88-89.

¹⁵² Yves Marsaudon, *Oecuménisme vu par un Maçon de Tradition* (pp. 119-120).

and birth control, are hotly debated within the Church itself; the word of the Sovereign Pontiff is questioned by bishops, by priests, by the faithful. For a Freemason, a man who questions dogma is already a Freemason without an apron.¹⁵³

Marcel Prelot, another enemy of the Catholic Church and a senator for the Doubs region in France, describes what has taken place. He wrote:

We had struggled for a century and a half to bring our opinions to prevail within the Church and had not succeeded. Finally, there came Vatican II and we triumphed. From then on the propositions and principles of liberal Catholicism have been definitively and officially accepted by Holy Church.¹⁵⁴

The Communists were equally delighted with the results of the Council. As the Italian Communist Party declared at its 11th Party Congress in 1964: “The extraordinary ‘awakening’ of the Council, which is rightly compared with the Estates General of 1789, has shown the whole world that the old politico-religious Bastille is shaken to its foundations.”¹⁵⁵ *L’Unita*, the official publication of the Italian Communist Party, brazenly gave advice to Pope Paul VI regarding Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, who led traditionalist opposition to the conciliar liberals and had militated for a conciliar condemnation of Communism: “Be conscious of the danger that Lefebvre represents. And continue the magnificent movement of approach begun with the ecumenism of Vatican II.”¹⁵⁶

A Whole New “Orientation” for the Church

The public exclamations of delight over Vatican II from neo-modernist luminaries, Communists and Masons should not be surprising. It was obvious to anyone who had eyes to see that the Second Vatican Council appeared to embrace ideas that had been condemned by Blessed Pope Pius IX in the *Syllabus of Errors*, but were in step with *Modernist thought*. (As we will discuss further, Cardinal Ratzinger has described certain aspects of the Council’s teaching as a “countersyllabus”.)

Here too, events since the first edition have provided confirmation of our analysis. In 2009 Monsignor Brunero Gherardini published a major book on Vatican II entitled *Vatican Council II: We Must Talk About It*.¹⁵⁷ Gherardini is nothing less than a Canon of St. Peter’s Basilica, a secretary for the Pontifical Academy of Theology, a professor emeritus at the Pontifical Lateran University, and the editor of *Divinitas*, a leading Roman theological journal. The book includes a foreword by

¹⁵³ Cited from *Open Letter to Confused Catholics*, pp. 88-89.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

¹⁵⁵ Bishop Graber, *Athanasius and the Church of Our Time*, p. 64.

¹⁵⁶ Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, *They Have Uncrowned Him*, (Kansas City, Missouri: Angelus Press, 1988) p. 229. Here Archbishop Lefebvre also notes that the Communist newspaper *Izvestia* demanded that Pope Paul VI condemn him and his seminary at Ecône.

¹⁵⁷ Brunero Gherardini, *Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II: Un Discorso da Fare* (Casa Mariana Editrice, Frigento, 2009).

Bishop Mario Oliveri (ordinary of the Italian dioceses of Albenga and Imperia) and an introduction by Archbishop Malcolm Ranjith, former secretary of the Congregation for Divine Worship and now Archbishop of Colombo. Gherardini makes this stunning admission from within the Vatican itself:

[M]odernistic ideas still can be found in several Council documents, notably in *Gaudium et Spes*, and a few prominent Council Fathers were openly sympathetic to old and new modernists. ... In short, their Church was to be a kind of research laboratory rather than a dispenser of Truths from on high.¹⁵⁸

The book, about to appear in English, is reportedly on the desk of Pope Benedict XVI. It represents a breakthrough for the effort to have an honest discussion of the Council's vexatious "pastoral" pronouncements. Once again events have shown that the "Fatimists" are not "crazy" but merely willing to say openly and honestly what many believe, but have not been willing to say before.

The situation Gherardini describes did not happen by accident, but by design. The progressivists at Vatican II sought to avoid direct statements which would easily be seen as condemned Modernist errors. They also deliberately planted ambiguities in the Council texts which they intended to exploit after the Council.¹⁵⁹

By utilizing deliberate ambiguities, the Council documents enabled the post-conciliar promotion of an ecumenism that had been condemned by Pope Pius XI, a religious liberty for false sects that had been condemned by the 19th Century Popes (especially Blessed Pius IX), a new liturgy along the lines of Protestantism and ecumenism that Archbishop Bugnini¹⁶⁰ called "a major conquest of the Catholic Church", a collegiality that strikes at the heart of the papal primacy, and a "new attitude toward the world"—especially in one of the most radical of all the Council documents, *Gaudium et Spes*. Even Pope Benedict XVI when he was Cardinal Ratzinger had admitted that *Gaudium et Spes* is permeated by the spirit of Teilhard de Chardin.¹⁶¹

The result of all this was nothing short of an entirely new orientation of the Church, or what Pope Paul VI called an "opening to the world." As Paul VI himself was forced to admit, however, the opening to the world proved to be a disastrous miscalculation.

¹⁵⁸ A. Zangrando, "Roman Landscape," *Latin Mass Magazine*, Summer 2009.

¹⁵⁹ The progressivist *periti* at the Council are on record stating, "We will express it in a diplomatic way, but after the Council, we shall draw the conclusions implicit in it." In Father Ralph Wiltgen's book, *The Rhine flows into the Tiber*, p. 242.

¹⁶⁰ The progressivist Archbishop Annibale Bugnini was the major architect of the liturgical revolution which culminated in the New Mass (*Novus Ordo*). He was eventually banished from the Vatican to Iran because Pope Paul VI was shown documents demonstrating that Bugnini was a Freemason. Michael Davies devotes an entire chapter to Archbishop Bugnini in *Pope Paul's New Mass*, (Angelus Press, Kansas City, 1992) Chapter 24.

¹⁶¹ Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, *Principles of Catholic Theology*, (Ignatius Press, San Francisco, 1987) p. 334.

Pope Paul VI Admits that the Church Has Been Invaded by Worldly Thinking

As Paul VI himself admitted only eight years after the Council, “the opening to the world has become a veritable invasion of the Church by worldly thinking. We have perhaps been too weak and imprudent.”^{161a} Only three years after the Council, Paul VI had admitted that “The Church is in a disturbed period of self-criticism, or what could better be called self-demolition.”¹⁶² And in 1972, in perhaps the most astonishing remark ever made by a Roman Pontiff, Paul VI lamented that “from somewhere or other the smoke of Satan has entered the temple of God.”¹⁶³

Let us consider some of the manifest reasons for Pope Paul VI's astounding admissions.

The Church “Opens” Herself to “Dialogue” with Communist and Masonic Enemies

With Vatican II began the large enterprise of collaboration with the forces of the world, the great opening to the world. Nowhere is this more apparent than in *Gaudium et Spes* itself, which declares: “By unremitting study they”—meaning every priest in the Catholic Church, every bishop, every member of the hierarchy—“should fit themselves to do their part in establishing dialogue with the world and with men of all shades of opinion”.

Now the objection will be raised: What is wrong with peaceful collaboration and dialogue with men of all shades of opinion in those areas in which the Church can find some sort of basic agreement? Here again the pre-conciliar Popes warned us about one of the devil's snares and delusions under the appearance of good. Speaking precisely about this call to collaborate and dialogue with Communists in causes which are supposedly common to all mankind—which is really the devil's call for the Church to lay down Her arms and join the enemy—Pope Pius XI warned as follows in *Divini Redemptoris*:

In the beginning Communism showed itself for what it was in all its perversity. But very soon it realized that it was alienating people. It has, therefore, changed its tactics and strives to entice the multitudes by trickery in various forms, hiding its real designs behind ideas that are in themselves good and attractive. ... Under various names that do not suggest Communism, they establish organizations and periodicals with the sole purpose of carrying their ideas into quarters otherwise inaccessible. They try perfidiously to worm their way even into professedly Catholic and religious organizations. Again, without receding an inch from their subversive principles, they invite Catholics to collaborate with them in the realm of so-

^{161a} Speech of November 23, 1973; quoted in Romano Amerio, *Iota Unum*, (Kansas City: Sarto House, 1996) pp. 9-10.

¹⁶² Speech to the Lombard College, December 7, 1968.

¹⁶³ Speech of June 30, 1972.

called humanitarianism and charity. And at times make proposals that are in perfect harmony with the Christian spirit and the doctrine of the Church.... See to it faithful brethren that the Faithful do not allow themselves to be deceived. ***Communism is intrinsically evil, and no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking whatsoever.***¹⁶⁴

Pope Pius XI could not have been clearer about the duty to shun “dialogue” and collaboration with Communists. And why? The Italians have a saying: *Dimmi con chi vai, e ti diro che sei*—“Tell me who you go with and I will tell you what you are.” As Pius XI recognized, if one associates with a certain class of people, one will inevitably be influenced to become as they are, in spite of oneself. If one collaborates with the forces of the world they will tend to seduce him; he will become like them. If the Church opens Herself to the world in the sense of ceasing Her opposition to the powers that She once opposed, and if She says instead that the Church will now collaborate and dialogue with Her enemies, Her members will, in time, become like those they once opposed. And the opening to the world will result in the Church becoming like the world, as Pope Paul VI himself was forced to admit in the statement quoted above.

The Church “Reconciles” Herself with Liberalism

Those “conservatives” who deny that Vatican II constitutes a break with tradition, or that it contradicts prior teaching, have failed to listen to the very movers and shakers of the Council, who shamelessly acknowledge the truth. Yves Congar, one of the Council’s “experts” and chief among the artisans of the Council’s reforms, remarked with quiet satisfaction that “The Church has had, peacefully, its October Revolution.”¹⁶⁵ Congar also admitted, as if it were something to be proud of, that Vatican II’s *Declaration on Religious Liberty* is contrary to the *Syllabus* of Blessed Pius IX.¹⁶⁶ He said:

It cannot be denied that the affirmation of religious liberty by Vatican II says materially something other than what the *Syllabus* of 1864 said, and even just about the opposite of propositions 16,

¹⁶⁴ Pope Pius XI, *Divini Redemptoris*, Encyclical on Atheistic Communism, March 19, 1937.

¹⁶⁵ Yves Congar, O.P., “Le Concile au jours le jours deuxième section” (“The Council day by day, second session”), (Paris, Cerf, 1964) p. 115.

¹⁶⁶ In truth, there can be no such thing as a “Counter-Syllabus”, since Blessed Pope Pius IX’s *Syllabus* of 1864 is plainly a solemn, definitive teaching binding on all Catholics (can. 750 § 2). In Paragraph 6 of the Encyclical *Quanta Cura* which was issued with the *Syllabus* on December 8, 1864, Blessed Pope Pius IX stated solemnly: “Amid, therefore, so great perversity of depraved opinions, We, well remembering Our Apostolic Office, and very greatly solicitous for Our most holy Religion, for sound doctrine and the salvation of souls which is entrusted to Us by God, and (solicitous also) for the welfare of human society itself, have thought it right to raise up Our Apostolic voice. Therefore, by Our Apostolic Authority, We reprobate, proscribe and condemn all the singular and evil opinions and doctrines severally mentioned in this Letter, and will and command that they be thoroughly held by all children of the Catholic Church as reprobated, proscribed and condemned. (Our emphasis) Taken from *The Popes Against Modern Errors*, (TAN Books and Publishers, Rockford, Illinois, 1999) p. 21.

17 and 19 of this document.¹⁶⁷

Congar thus blithely suggests that Vatican II has undone an infallible papal condemnation of error.

Most noteworthy are the statements of the progressivist Cardinal Suenens, one of the most liberal prelates of the Twentieth Century, himself a Council Father, who spoke glowingly of the old regimes that have come crashing down. The words he used in praise of the Council are supremely telling, perhaps the most chilling and the most damning of all. Suenens declared “Vatican II is the French Revolution of the Church.”¹⁶⁸

And, only a few years ago, even the then-Cardinal Ratzinger, apparently unruffled by such admissions, added that the Vatican II text *Gaudium et Spes* is nothing less than a “counter-Syllabus”. He said:

If it is desirable to offer a diagnosis of the text (*Gaudium et Spes*) as a whole, we might say that (in conjunction with the texts on religious liberty, and world religions) it is a revision of the *Syllabus* of Pius IX, a kind of *countersyllabus* ... Let us be content to say here that the text serves as a *countersyllabus* and, as such, represents on the part of the Church, an attempt at an official reconciliation with the new era inaugurated in 1789. ... the one-sidedness of the position adopted by the Church under Pius IX and Pius X in response to the situation created by the new phase of history inaugurated by the French Revolution was, to a large extent, corrected *via facti*, especially in Central Europe, but there was still no basic statement of the relationship that should exist between the Church and the world that had come into existence after 1789. In fact, an attitude that was largely pre-revolutionary continued to exist in countries with strong Catholic majorities. Hardly anyone will deny today that the Spanish and Italian Concordats strove to preserve too much of a view of the world that no longer corresponded to the facts. Hardly anyone will deny today that, in the field of education and with respect to the historico-critical method in modern science, anachronisms existed that corresponded closely to this adherence to an obsolete Church-State relationship.¹⁶⁹

Consider a Cardinal calling two of the greatest Popes in Church history “one-sided” in their efforts to protect the Church from the errors of liberalism and modernism! According to the then-Cardinal Ratzinger, at Vatican II the Church made an “attempt” to “correct” and “counter” the teaching of Blessed Pius IX and Saint Pius X, and to reconcile Herself instead *with the French Revolution* and the Enlightenment.

But this was the very goal of the Permanent Instruction, Masonry's blueprint for subversion of the Church! That is precisely why, in his *Syllabus of Errors*, Blessed Pius IX condemned the proposition that “The Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself and come to

¹⁶⁷ Yves Congar, *La Crise d'Église et Msgr. Lefebvre*, (Paris, Cerf, 1977) p. 54.

¹⁶⁸ Cited from *Open Letter to Confused Catholics*, p. 100.

¹⁶⁹ Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, *Principles of Catholic Theology*, pp. 381-382.

terms with progress, liberalism and modern civilization.” (Condemned Proposition #80). And Saint Pius X, in his apostolic letter *Notre Charge Apostolique*, condemned the Sillon movement in France, rebuking its members because “They do not fear to make blasphemous reconciliations between the Gospel and the Revolution.”

But according to Cardinal Ratzinger, “*there can be no return to the Syllabus*, which may have marked the first stage in the confrontation with liberalism but cannot be the last stage.”¹⁷⁰ And what is this last “stage” in the “confrontation with liberalism”? Apparently, in Cardinal Ratzinger’s view, it is the Church’s *acceptance* of the very ideas She once condemned! Confronting liberalism by *reconciling* with it is doubletalk. The then-Cardinal Ratzinger’s “confrontation” with liberalism is nothing more than an abject surrender.

Moreover, it was apparently the opinion of the then-Cardinal Ratzinger, that not only the condemnations of liberalism in the *Syllabus* of Blessed Pius IX but also the anti-modernist teaching of Saint Pius X in *Pascendi* must now be considered outdated. In 1990, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith issued an “Instruction on the Theologian’s Ecclesiastical Vocation.” In explaining the Instruction to the press, Cardinal Ratzinger claimed that certain teachings of the Magisterium were “not considered to be the final word on the subject as such, but serve rather as a mooring in the problem, and, above all, as an expression of pastoral prudence, a kind of *temporary disposition*.”¹⁷¹ As examples of these “temporary dispositions,” the then-Cardinal Ratzinger cited “the statements of the Popes during the last century on religious freedom, as well as the anti-modernist decisions at the beginning of this century ...”¹⁷²—that is, the anti-modernist teaching of Saint Pius X in the early 1900s.

These comments by Cardinal Ratzinger are disturbing to a Catholic, not only because they admit that the Council embraced a cherished goal of the Church’s enemies, but because they come from the then-Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF), who is responsible for *guarding* the purity of Catholic doctrine. And this, as we shall soon show, is the same man who seemed to be leading us away from the traditional Catholic understanding of the Message of Fatima.¹⁷³

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 191.

¹⁷¹ *L’Osservatore Romano*, English Weekly Edition, July 2, 1990, p. 5.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*

¹⁷³ Since this was written in 2002, there’s some good news to report on this front. First, whereas the then-Cardinal Ratzinger on June 26, 2000 seemed to state that the Immaculate Heart of Mary was no different from any other holy person’s heart (see *TMF*, page 39 and the analysis of his statement provided on pages 128-130 of this book), Cardinal Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI) seemed to reverse himself on June 5, 2005, less than two months after his election to the papacy, when he said the Immaculate Heart of Mary is the closest heart to the Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ.

Secondly, on June 26, 2000, Cardinal Ratzinger strongly suggested that the prophetic words of Fatima referring to “the Triumph of the Immaculate Heart of Mary” was about something 2000 years in the past. On May 13, 2009, now as Pope Benedict XVI, he reversed himself and addressed a prayer to the Blessed Virgin Mary in the most

The Teaching that the Roman Catholic Church Is Exclusively the One True Church of Christ Is Abandoned

As the attempt to reconcile the Church with the diabolical principles of the French Revolution would neutralize the Church's once fierce opposition to the errors of the modern age, so would the "ecumenical venture" launched at the Council soon bring about the *de facto* abandonment of all efforts to convert heretics (e.g. Protestants) and schismatics to the Catholic Faith—as in the conversion of Russia.

At the same time the Council embraced the "ecumenical movement"—only 35 years after Pope Pius XI had condemned it in his encyclical *Mortalium Animos*—the Council's document *Lumen Gentium* threw into confusion the whole doctrine of the Catholic Church as the one true Church. According to *Lumen Gentium* "the Church of Christ ... *subsists* in the Catholic Church." (Emphasis added.)

This causes bewilderment. Why doesn't the document clearly proclaim what the Catholic Church has always taught, as seen in the encyclicals of Pope Pius XII—namely, that the one true Church of Christ is the Catholic Church?¹⁷⁴ Why employ a term favorable to the progressivist error that the Church of Christ is actually *bigger* than the Catholic Church, so that schismatic and heretical (e.g. Protestant) sects are "in some mysterious way" part of (or linked with) the Church of Christ? This error, based upon Vatican II's use of the word "subsists", is trumpeted by Father Avery Dulles, who was made a Cardinal by Pope John Paul II. He said:

The Church of Jesus Christ is not exclusively identical to the Roman Catholic Church. It does indeed subsist in Roman Catholicism, but it is also present in varying modes and degrees in other Christian communities to the extent that they too are what God initiated in Jesus and are obedient to the inspirations of Christ's Spirit. As a result of their common sharing in the reality of the one Church, the several Christian communities already have with one another a real but imperfect communion.¹⁷⁵

The former Cardinal Ratzinger also appeared to embrace the views of the "new theology." In an interview with the German newspaper

significant town of Bethlehem, where the Blessed Virgin gave birth to the Son of God, and he reminded Our Lady of Her promise and prediction: "In the end, My Immaculate Heart will triumph", and prayed to Her that "May it be so."

¹⁷⁴ In the 1943 encyclical *Mystici Corporis*, Pope Pius XII taught that "the true Church of Jesus Christ ... is the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Roman Church." This clearly means that the Church of Christ is not composed of the Catholic Church and other "Christian" denominations. Pope Pius XII reiterated this doctrine in his 1950 encyclical *Humani Generis*: "The Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same thing."

¹⁷⁵ Taken from *Vatican II, the Work That Needs to Be Done*, edited by David Tracy with Hans Küng and Johann Metz (Concillium, Seabury Press, New York, 1978) p. 91 (emphasis added).

Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, the Cardinal declared as follows:

When the Council Fathers replaced the word “is” with the word “subsistit” [subsists], they did so for a very precise reason. The concept expressed by “is” (to be) is far broader than that expressed by “to subsist.” “To subsist” is a very precise way of being, that is, to be as a subject, which exists in itself. Thus the Council Fathers meant to say that *the being of the Church as such is a broader entity than the Roman Catholic Church*, but within the latter it acquires, in an incomparable way, the character of a true and proper subject.¹⁷⁶

Cardinal Ratzinger was claiming that the Council Fathers *intended* to say that the “being” of the Church is broader than the Catholic Church, but this claim is false. The generality of the Council Fathers had no intention of contradicting the teaching of Pope Pius XII that the Church of Christ *is* the Catholic Church, not some vague “entity” that is “broader” than the Catholic Church.

In truth, this ambiguity undermines the traditional teaching that the one and only Church of Christ *is* the Catholic Church—an intention he shared with his fellow partisans of the “new theology” at Vatican II. We know this because Father Ratzinger, serving as a theological *peritus* at the Council, was the *peritus* (so-called “expert”) who introduced the term “subsistit” (subsists) into the drafting of the conciliar document *Lumen Gentium*. He inserted this term at the suggestion of a *Protestant minister*, Pastor Schmidt, from Germany.

The former Cardinal’s explanation of the meaning of “subsistit” (subsists) in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* was as confusing as the term itself. “Subsists” and “is” can, however, mean the very same thing, contrary to what Cardinal Ratzinger suggested at the time. For the sake of the precision that should characterize any conciliar document, the Council ought to have stated clearly that “The Church of Christ subsists *only* in the Catholic Church.” But as Father Edward Schillebeeckx, another conciliar *peritus*, admitted, his liberal confreres had deliberately inserted ambiguities into the conciliar texts,¹⁷⁷ knowing that they would later be able to interpret them in a heterodox manner after the Council.

Objectively speaking, that truly is what Father Ratzinger did at the Council when he introduced the term “subsistit.” In fact, the original German text of the above-quoted interview in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* shows that use of the term was a *knowing departure* from the teaching of Pope Pius XII: “... die Konzilsväter das von Pius XII gebrauchte Wort ‘ist’ durch ‘subsistit’ ersetzten”—which translates as:

¹⁷⁶ *L’Osservatore Romano*, Italian edition, October 8, 2000, p. 4: “Quando i Padri conciliari sostituirono la parola ‘è’ con la parola ‘subsistit’ lo fecero con uno scopo ben preciso. Il concetto espresso da ‘è’ (essere) è più ampio di quello espresso da ‘sussistere.’ ‘Sussistere’ un modo ben preciso di essere, ossia essere come soggetto che esiste in sé. I Padri conciliari dunque intendevano dire che l’essere della Chiesa in quanto tale è un’entità più ampia della Chiesa cattolica romana, ...”

¹⁷⁷ See statements by Father Schillebeeckx in the Dutch magazine *De Bauwijn*, No. 16, 1965, quoted in the French translation in *Itinéraires*, No. 155, 1971, p. 40.

“... the Council Fathers replaced the word ‘is,’ used by Pius XII, with ‘subsistit.’” That is, Cardinal Ratzinger admitted that Vatican II replaced the established terminology of papal teaching. Even worse, the original German of the interview further states: “So wollten die Väter sagen: Das Sein der Kirche als solches *reicht viel weiter* als die römisch-katholische Kirche,”—which translates as: “Thus the Fathers meant to say: the being of the Church as such *extends much further* than the Roman Catholic Church.”¹⁷⁸ Thus, Dulles and the former Cardinal Ratzinger contradicted the perennial Catholic teaching that the Church of Christ *exists exclusively* in the Catholic Church. **Yet their view was allowed to become the common interpretation of Vatican II.** Here we see a prime example of how the “new theologians” at Vatican II passed the theological football to themselves, while pretending that it was “the Council” that had thrown the pass.

But here, yet again, events since the first edition of this book have confirmed a problem we identified. None other than the former Cardinal Ratzinger himself, now Pope Benedict, has attempted to clarify the deep confusion in the Church caused by the use of “subsists in the Catholic Church” instead of simply “*is the Catholic Church*”. On June 29, 2007 the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF) issued a document entitled “Responses to Some Questions Regarding Certain Aspects of the Doctrine on the Church” which presented formal responses to questions about the Council’s teaching in this area. The document begins with the astonishing admission that “the Congregation wishes to respond to these questions by clarifying the authentic meaning of some ecclesiological expressions used by the magisterium which are open to misunderstanding in the theological debate.” In other words, it is the “ecclesiological expressions” of the *Second Vatican Council* that are “open to misunderstanding” and therefore must now be clarified—*more than forty years after the Council ended!*

Accordingly, one question addressed is: “Why was the expression ‘subsists in’ adopted instead of the simple word ‘is’?” In response the CDF states: “The use of this expression, which indicates *the full identity of the Church of Christ with the Catholic Church*, does not change the doctrine on the Church. Rather, it comes from and brings out more clearly the fact that there are ‘numerous elements of sanctification and of truth’ which are found outside her structure, but which ‘as gifts properly belonging to the Church of Christ, impel towards Catholic Unity.’”¹⁷⁹

This response at least negates that interpretation of the Council—promoted by the former Cardinal Ratzinger himself—which denied that the Church of Christ and the Catholic Church are “one and the same

¹⁷⁸ *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, September 22, 2000; Italian translation in *L'Osservatore Romano*, October 8, 2000.

¹⁷⁹ June 29, 2007, Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF), “Responses to Some Questions Regarding Certain Aspects of the Doctrine on the Church,” Third Question, at www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20070629_responsa-quaestiones_en.html.

thing.” It is worth recalling here that the Catholic Church has always taught and Pius XII insisted in *Humani Generis* that the Catholic Church is the Church of Jesus Christ. But while the problem with “subsists in” is addressed, the related novel expression pertaining to “elements of sanctification and truth” outside the Church’s “subsistence” in Her visible structure remains obscure. Does the expression connote only valid sacraments such as marriages by an Orthodox priest, or a baptism by a Protestant minister which the Church nonetheless recognizes as valid and thus as “elements of sanctification” to be found outside Her visible structure? Or does it extend even to preaching by non-Catholic ministers that happens to be true on this or that point (for whatever that truth is worth in the context of preaching also filled with objective heresies)?

Just how problematic the expression remains becomes apparent from the CDF’s own comment on the interpretation of Vatican II according to which these “elements” outside the Church mean that the Church is “present” wherever these elements are. To quote the CDF directly: “It is **possible**, according to Catholic doctrine, to affirm correctly that the Church of Christ is present and operative in the churches and ecclesial Communities not yet fully in communion with the Catholic Church, on account of the elements of sanctification and truth that are present in them. **Nevertheless, the word ‘subsists’ can only be attributed to the Catholic Church alone** (emphasis added).”¹⁸⁰

Note well: This remarkable statement concedes that it is only *possible* to affirm this reading of the Council in accordance with Catholic doctrine, whereas the Council’s Modernist proponents had insisted on a binding “development” of doctrine requiring Catholics to believe that the Church is somehow “present and operative” outside of Herself in some ill-defined way. Is it not astounding, and indeed alarming, that the CDF is reduced to saying that it is “merely *possible* to affirm” consistently with the Faith what *an ecumenical Council purportedly taught*?

So, the Council’s grave ambiguity on the doctrine of the Church persists despite this clarification. Indeed, the very need to issue clarifications of the Council’s teaching in the first place indicates a totally unprecedented problem with its novel and ambiguous formulations. This in itself is a disquieting “sign of the times” that must be read in the light of Fatima. One is reminded immediately of Pius XII’s own reading of the signs of times in light of Fatima in 1931, which led him to warn of “innovators” who would very soon attempt the “suicide” of altering the faith, in Her liturgy, Her theology and *the very soul* of the Church.¹⁸¹

The Church No Longer Seeks the Conversion and Return of Heretics and Schismatics

Despite the recent attempt at a clarification just noted, the erroneous view persists that the Church of Christ is something much bigger

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., Response to Second Question.

¹⁸¹ See Pope Pius XII on pages 36-37 of this book.

than, and therefore is not the same as, the Roman Catholic Church. Consequently, it is no wonder that after 45 years of “ecumenical activity” even Vatican prelates now openly repudiate the return of Protestants and schismatics to Rome.

One prominent example of this departure from traditional teaching is the statement of Cardinal Walter Kasper, the former secretary of the Church’s most prominent post-conciliar heretic, Hans Küng. Kasper, whose Modernist views are well-known throughout the Church, was made a Cardinal by Pope John Paul II in February 2001 and now still enjoys (at the time of this writing, December 2009) the rank of Prefect of the Vatican’s Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity. Kasper said:

... today we no longer understand ecumenism in the sense of a return, by which the others would ‘be converted’ and return to being ‘Catholics’. This was expressly abandoned at Vatican II.¹⁸²

In fact, Kasper’s statement scorns the thrice-defined infallible dogma that “outside the Church there is no salvation.” (*extra ecclesia nulla salus*) The actual wording of these three solemn, infallible (and, therefore, impossible to change)¹⁸³ definitions that are binding on all Catholics¹⁸⁴ (of whatever rank, including Cardinals and Popes) to believe, under pain of being automatically excommunicated (expelling themselves from the Catholic Church) are as follows:

There is but one universal Church of the faithful, outside which no one at all is saved. (Pope Innocent III, Fourth Lateran Council, 1215; Dz. 430; D.S. 802)

We declare, say, define, and pronounce that it is absolutely necessary for the salvation of every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff. (Pope Boniface VIII, the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, 1302; Dz. 469; D.S. 873)

The most Holy Roman Church firmly believes, professes and preaches that none of those existing outside the Catholic Church, not only pagans, but also Jews and heretics and schismatics, can have a share in life eternal; but that they will go into the eternal fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels, unless before death they are joined with Her; and that so important is the unity

¹⁸² *Adista*, February 26, 2001. English translation quoted from “Where Have They Hidden the Body?” by Christopher Ferrara, *The Remnant*, June 30, 2001.

¹⁸³ “We, with the approval of the sacred council, teach and define that it is a divinely revealed dogma: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when, acting in the office of shepherd and teacher of all Christians, he defines, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, doctrine concerning faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, [he] possesses through the divine assistance promised to him in the person of St. Peter, the infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed His Church to be endowed in defining doctrine concerning faith or morals; and that such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are therefore irreformable because of their nature [*ex sese*], but not because of the agreement of the Church.” (D.S. 1839)

¹⁸⁴ “But if anyone presumes to contradict this Our definition (God forbid that he do so): let him be anathema.” (D.S. 1840)

of this ecclesiastical body that only those remaining within this unity can profit by the sacraments of the Church unto salvation, and they alone can receive an eternal recompense for their fasts, their almsgivings, their other works of Christian piety and the duties of a Christian soldier. No one, let his almsgiving be as great as it may, no one, even if he pour out his blood for the Name of Christ, can be saved, unless he remain within the bosom and the unity of the Catholic Church. (Pope Eugene IV, the Bull *Cantate Domino*, 1442; Dz. 714; D.S. 1351)

Because this often misunderstood teaching is the focal point of the attack on Catholic dogma by the Church's sworn enemies, namely Masonry, it needs further explanation and defense.

The dogma means exactly what it says: if you have not received the Baptism that Jesus Christ prescribed—which is, in the normal course of Providence, the baptism of water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost—then you cannot go to Heaven.

But although Baptism and membership in the Church are necessary to salvation, they are not enough (except for infants who are baptized and who die before the age of reason). We must also live the moral law of Christ and love God with all our heart and our neighbor as ourselves. We must also receive the other Sacraments worthily.

This teaching does not deny the possibility of salvation for all souls who have not become formal members of the Catholic Church. It is possible that someone may never have had the Gospel preached to him.

If such a person were to keep all the gravely binding Commandments of God's law knowable by the light of reason alone (and in case he committed a mortal sin, he were to repent of it with a perfect act of contrition), he could be saved, but only if it were through no fault of his own that he did not know his obligation to be baptized, join the Catholic Church and practice the Catholic Faith.

For a non-Catholic to be saved in this manner would obviously be much more difficult than for a Catholic to be saved with the help of dogma, the examples of saints and the grace of the seven Sacraments.

Many are prone to self-deception, especially in these dark times, and many people who consider themselves to be of good will might easily find the truth of the Gospel if they honestly sought it. It may be that some prefer darkness to light. So we ought never to presume that a person is without fault in failing to be baptized and practice the Catholic Faith. Thus, in general, the salvation of non-Catholics is at greater risk.

In charity, we must pray and make sacrifices for the conversion of all non-Catholics.

But charity also forbids us to assign bad will or culpability to someone, or to judge him as irreformable. We must remember the examples of St. Mary Magdalen, a notorious sinner, and St. Paul, a persecutor of the Church, who both converted and drew many souls to

Christ and His Church. All things are possible with God.

But the question is raised: How could a just and merciful God give some souls the benefit of being born Catholic and deny it to others, if the Catholic Faith is essential to salvation? Should not all be given an equal chance to reach Heaven? And why should some people be denied the opportunity to have the Gospel preached to them and be put at so great a disadvantage in saving their souls? Here, we see the democratic ideology of our age at work, along with a presumption that we can judge the ways of God.

We must begin to answer these objections by establishing the authority of the Church and Her claim on our belief:

- 1) The Catholic Church is “the pillar and ground of the truth.” (1 Tim. 3:15)
- 2) The Catholic Church is the one Church of God founded by Jesus Christ, who Himself is accredited by God His Father and by His many prophecies and miracles—especially His Resurrection from the dead. The Catholic Church is historically the Church He founded, and accredited as the one true Church of God. The authenticity of the Catholic Church is also guaranteed by the miracles of holiness as well as physical and moral miracles through the centuries and continuing into our own day.
- 3) The Catholic Church has defined infallibly that outside the Church there is no salvation. An infallible definition by its very nature is not able to be re-defined into another sense. The definition cannot fail—it is irreformable—it is the absolute truth which does not change.

The Modernist objects to such definitions. He says: “The truth is not something I know with my intellect; it is something I feel; and my feelings change, so the truth can and does change.”

The Modernist who seriously professes that belief is already outside the Church since he denies Scripture: “Jesus Christ, yesterday, and today; and the same for ever.” (Heb. 13:8)

But the Catholic of weak faith or of poor intellectual formation—though he might hold a Ph.D. or degree in theology—also raises the objection: the dogma “outside the Church there is no salvation” does not seem capable of being reconciled with the teachings that God is all just and God would not condemn to hell someone who through no fault of his own does not know this teaching because it has never been preached to him.

Again, we must begin with authoritative teaching, this time from the Gospel itself:

“But without faith it is impossible to please God. For he that cometh to God, must believe that He is, and is a rewarder to them that seek Him.” (Heb. 11:6)

“Neither is there salvation in any other. For there is no other Name under Heaven given to men, whereby we must be saved.” (Acts 4:12)

“...unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” (John 3:5)

“He that believes and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believes not shall be condemned.” (Mark 16:16)

So how do we reconcile apparently contradictory teachings of the necessity to believe in Jesus Christ and to be a member of His Church to be saved, and the Justice, Fairness and Holiness of God toward an individual who has not heard the Gospel preached to him at all; or been denied the fullness of the Gospel, such as a second-generation Protestant or Greek Orthodox or one raised in Jewish cultures? And the answer is that God is All Holy, All Just and All Good and will not condemn to the pains of hell one who is not guilty of personal mortal sin.

The personal mortal sin of unbelief condemned by Jesus more than once is the refusal to acknowledge the truth of the whole Gospel—the whole dogma of the Catholic Church—even after it has been testified to by evident signs, wonders and miracles that only God can perform.

The First Vatican Council taught most reasonably on the question of faith:

Because man depends entirely on God as his Creator and Lord and because created reason is wholly subordinate to uncreated Truth, we are obliged to render by faith a full submission of intellect and will to God when He makes a revelation (*see canon 1*). This faith, however, which is the beginning of human salvation, the Catholic Church asserts to be a supernatural virtue. By that faith, with the inspiration and help of God’s grace, we believe that what He has revealed is true—not because its intrinsic truth is seen with the natural light of reason, but because of the authority of God who reveals it, of God who can neither deceive nor be deceived (*see canon 2*). For, on the word of the Apostle: “Faith is the substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of things that are not seen” (*Heb. 11:1*).

Nevertheless, in order that the submission of our faith might be consonant with reason (*see Rom. 12:1*), **God has willed that external proofs of His revelation, namely divine acts and especially miracles and prophecies, should be added to the internal aids given by the Holy Spirit. Since these proofs so excellently display God’s omnipotence and limitless knowledge, they constitute the surest signs of divine revelation, signs that are suitable to everyone’s understanding** (*see canons 3-4*). Therefore, not only Moses and the prophets but also and preeminently Christ Our Lord performed

many evident miracles and made clear-cut prophecies. Moreover, we read of the Apostles: "But they went forth and preached everywhere, while the Lord worked with them and confirmed the preaching by the signs that followed" (*Mark 16:20*). And likewise it is written: "We have the word of prophecy, surer still, to which you do well to attend, as to a lamp shining in a dark place" (*II Pet. 1:19*).

It is clear that many people in our cities and country have been exposed to the testimony of evident miracles proving the Catholic Faith is the one true teaching of Jesus Christ. The Miracle of the Sun at Fatima is one such miracle. Thus we must remember what the Church has infallibly defined at Vatican Council I:

(*Canon 4*) If anyone says that all miracles are impossible and, hence, that all accounts of them, even though contained in Sacred Scripture, should be classed with fables and myths; or that miracles can never be recognized with certainty and that the divine origin of the Christian religion cannot be successfully proved by them: let him be anathema.

But what about the person who never had the law of the Gospel preached to him and does not know that outside the Church there is no salvation? If such a person exists, God, the just lawgiver, would hold him bound by the Natural Law—the law written on the heart of each man who comes into the world.

That law is promulgated by the very fact that each and every man who reaches the age of reason knows there is the Natural Law to follow.

And one of the first precepts of the Natural Law is to seek the truth, obey it and follow it wherever it leads. "Seek and you shall find," said Jesus.

So if a person has diligently searched all his life and not found the Gospel or the Church through no fault of his own, he can be saved, in God's special providence outside the Gospel law promulgated for all men.

But that is a special exception, not the rule, and no one can know who has exercised sufficient good will and due diligence in seeking the ways of God. "Who has weighed the human heart?," asks God in *Isaias*, and God answers that no one except God Himself can understand fully the human heart of each individual. St. Jerome, at the end of his life, in the presence of his disciples, spoke these dreadful words: "Out of one hundred thousand people whose lives have always been bad, you will find barely one who is worthy of indulgence."

At the end of the day, the exception to the rule is only that—an exception in a particular case. The dogma "outside the Church there is no salvation" stands vindicated 100% of the time, because in that exceptional case God would have caused that exception to be joined to the Church in a special way. We must uphold the dogma—we must believe the dogma. We must defend this dogmatic teaching of the

Catholic Faith.

As Blessed Pius IX taught in *Singulari Quadem*, Catholics must not preoccupy themselves with pointless speculation about salvation for those who—through no fault of their own—are not formal members of the Church, since only God knows whom He will save (in some extraordinary manner) from among the great mass of humanity which has not exteriorly professed the Catholic religion.

Blessed Pius IX—whom Pope John Paul II himself beatified—exhorted the faithful to hold fast to the dogma “outside the Church there is no salvation” and to continue with ever greater fervor the divinely appointed work of the Church in making disciples of all nations. As for the lot of those who—through no fault of their own—remain outside the visible Church, His Holiness warned that “all further inquiry is unlawful.”

Who can doubt the wisdom of Blessed Pius IX’s warning? Indeed, the Church has also taught constantly and infallibly that no one in this world (absent a special private revelation) can know with absolute certainty the subjective state of any soul, much less whether a soul—even one’s own—is numbered among the elect. Since it is not possible for the Church to presume (except in the case of canonized saints) that *any individual* is either saved or damned, the ministers of the Church are duty-bound to seek the conversion of every man, woman and child on the face of the earth, following Our Lord’s own command: “Go forth and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded thee” (Matt. 28:19-20); “He who believes and is baptized shall be saved; he who believes not shall be condemned.” (Mk. 16:16)

And in this dogma of no salvation outside the Catholic Church we have another reason in charity to promote the whole Message of Fatima—particularly the Consecration of Russia by the Pope and the Catholic bishops of the world. Because when this is finally done, Russia will be converted to the one true Church of Jesus Christ—the Catholic Church. The people of Russia will become Catholics and their salvation morally certain if they remain in the fervent practice of the Catholic Faith until their death. Millions more souls will be saved.

Not only will the Russians be saved, but billions of souls in the rest of the world will be converted to Christ and His Church—the Catholic Church. We know that because Our Lady predicted “a period of peace will be given to the world”. But there can be no peace if it is not based upon the teaching and practices of the Prince of Peace—Jesus Christ. For men and women to live the teachings of Jesus Christ, they must believe the Gospel, be baptized and practice the Catholic Faith. This will happen at some time—Sacred Scripture tells us when all the nations will enter into the Catholic Church: “Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob, and He will teach us His ways, and we will walk in His paths” (Isaias 2:3).

But this will only come about through the Consecration of Russia, after which the scandal of billions living in moral squalor, schism, heresy, paganism and other false religions will be ended by that obedience of the Pope to Our Lady of Fatima. We must sacrifice ourselves for this intention and pray, as Our Lady of Fatima said on June 13, 1929.

But the present-day scandal of Vatican officials in high places abandoning *de facto* the promotion of the Catholic dogma “outside the Church there is no salvation” must be examined further, so we continue with the examination of Cardinal Kasper’s false teaching.

By declaring that Protestants need no longer convert to Catholicism, Cardinal Kasper brazenly defies both the infallible teaching of the Magisterium and the commands of Our Lord Himself. Kasper’s view also flatly contradicts the Church’s constant teaching that the only way to Christian unity is *the return of the dissidents* to the Catholic Church through their conversion. In the 1949 admonition of the Holy Office of Pope Pius XII concerning the “ecumenical movement,” the bishops were warned that in any “ecumenical” discussions they might authorize, the Protestant interlocutors must be presented with “the Catholic truth” and “the teaching of the Encyclicals of the Roman Pontiffs on *the return of the dissidents* to the Church.”¹⁸⁵ The Catholic doctrine of the return of the dissidents was stressed by Pope Pius XII on December 20, 1949: “The Catholic doctrine will have to be proposed and exposed totally and integrally: what the Catholic Church teaches about the true nature and means of justification, about the constitution of the Church, about the primacy of the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, about the only true union which is accomplished with the *return of the dissidents* to the only true Church of Christ, must not be passed over in silence or covered over in ambiguous words.”¹⁸⁶

At least Kasper says openly what most of today’s modernist prelates seem to believe, but will neither confirm nor deny. Yet Kasper’s policy represents the still-prevailing “spirit of Vatican II,” despite Benedict’s call for a “hermeneutic of continuity” in reading the Council—in itself a devastating implied admission that the Council lent itself to a reading in *discontinuity* with prior Church teaching. That the Council lends itself to the view that the conversion of non-Catholics is no longer necessary was confirmed by the former Cardinal Ratzinger, when he was still Father Ratzinger, in his 1966 book *Theological Highlights of Vatican II*. In *Theological Highlights* the then-Father Ratzinger claimed that the Council had given the Church *a new orientation toward non-Catholics*, which dispenses with any call for their conversion:

The Catholic Church has no right to absorb the other Churches ... [A] basic unity—of Churches that remain Churches, yet become one Church—*must replace the idea of conversion*, even though

¹⁸⁵ *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, AAS 42, p. 142.

¹⁸⁶ Pius XII, Instruction of the Holy Office, *Ecclesia Catholica*, December 20, 1949 (“On the Ecumenical Movement”).

conversion retains its meaningfulness for those in conscience motivated to seek it.¹⁸⁷

Now, the then-Father Ratzinger wrote this book during the Council. As a co-worker with Karl Rahner, he was heavily involved with drafting the conciliar documents. He is in a position to tell us what were the actual intentions of the “architects” of Vatican II, which is not to be confused with the intention of the Council Fathers themselves. And he declares that the teaching of Vatican II, according to those who drew up the documents, was that conversion is an option.¹⁸⁸ That is, according to him, the non-Catholic need not convert to the true Church—either for salvation or for unity.

This view is no less radical than that of Father Edward Schillebeeckx, another progressivist Council *peritus*, who was investigated by the Vatican after the Council (but never disciplined) for his open denial of various Catholic dogmas. Schillebeeckx exulted that “At Vatican II, the Catholic Church officially abandoned its monopoly over the Christian religion.”¹⁸⁹

Likewise, a “Catholic” journal from the Rome-based International Jewish-Christian Documentation Service (SIDIC)¹⁹⁰ spoke of Vatican II’s new orientation toward non-Catholics. In 1999 it spotlighted what it considers to be the “main problem” with so-called “traditional Catholics”, including Archbishop Lefebvre:

Lefebvre’s refusal to accept ecumenism originates in clear teachings from the Magisterium: the encyclical *Satis Cognitum* of Leo XIII (1896); the encyclical *Mortalium Animos* of Pius XI (1928); the Dec. 20, 1949, Instruction of the Holy Office regarding ecumenism. The only ecumenism accepted by Lefebvre and his followers is that which strives for the **unconditional return** of the members of other confessions to the one Church of Christ, the Roman Catholic Church. **This hardened sectarianism is precisely the kind of logic which Vatican II**, through profound reflection on the nature of the Church, **refused to accept**. Though rooted in Tradition [sic]

¹⁸⁷ (Emphasis added) *Theological Highlights of Vatican II*, Father Joseph Ratzinger [Paulist Press, New York, 1966], pp. 65-66. This section of the book focuses on the deliberate ecumenical foundation on which is based the Council document *Lumen Gentium*. For a more complete discussion of Father Ratzinger’s book, see “Vatican II vs. the Unity Willed by Christ,” by J. Vennari, *Catholic Family News*, December 2000.

¹⁸⁸ Even if Cardinal Ratzinger completely changed his own personal views to a more orthodox position, the Council texts themselves remain ambiguous, imprecise, and appear to be oriented toward an unorthodox ecumenism which does not seek the conversion of non-Catholics to Catholicism.

¹⁸⁹ E. Schillebeeckx, OP, *Igreja ou igrejas?*, in VA. *Cinco problemas que desafiam a Igreja hoje*, pp. 26f. Cited from *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*, Atila Sinke Guimarães, (Maeta, Metairie, Louisiana, 1997) p. 243.

¹⁹⁰ SIDIC is an association identifying itself as Catholic that was “founded in Rome in 1965 at the request of a group of experts of the Second Vatican Council following the promulgation of *Nostra Aetate*”, to promote Catholic-Jewish “dialogue”. The Rome-based SIDIC has local representatives in the following countries: Australia, Belgium, Canada, England, France, Holland, Israel, Italy, United States. *Nostra Aetate* is the Council’s “Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions”.

the scope of the Council's reflection was without precedent in the history of Christianity. For integralists, ecumenism is one of the fundamental betrayals by Vatican II.¹⁹¹

The novel claim that non-Catholics need not convert because they are "in some mysterious way" part of the Church of Christ¹⁹² scorns the Church's perennial teaching on the necessity of non-Catholics to abandon their errors and return to the one true Church of Jesus Christ, as the pre-conciliar Popes unanimously taught.

There are reported cases of Vatican Cardinals *actively discouraging* non-Catholics who desire to convert to Catholicism, evidently in keeping with this same false interpretation of the Council. *Catholic Family News* published the story of Father Linus Dragu Popian, who had been raised in the Romanian Orthodox religion. In 1975 he risked his life to escape Communist Romania and presented himself as a seminarian to the Vatican, expressing his wish to convert to Catholicism. The then-Secretary of State, Cardinal Villot, and other Vatican Cardinals were horrified. They told young Popian that he must not flee Communism and must not become Catholic, because this would damage the Vatican's relations with Communist Romania and the Romanian Orthodox Church.¹⁹³

Little has changed in Rome since then. Bishop Fellay of the Society of St. Pius X related in a 2001 interview that he had met a schismatic (Orthodox) bishop who wanted to convert to the Catholic Church. Bishop Fellay advised him to deal directly with Rome. When the Orthodox bishop told the Vatican he wanted to become a Catholic, "panic ensued. The following day, Cardinal Neves, Prefect of the Congregation of Bishops said to the schismatic bishop, 'Your Excellency, it is not necessary to convert. Since the Council, things have changed! There's no need to convert any more.'"¹⁹⁴

This deliberate refusal to allow a schismatic Orthodox bishop to return to Rome is completely in line with the Balamand Declaration of 1993, negotiated between certain Vatican officials and various Orthodox churches. In this document the Vatican's representative (Cardinal Cassidy of the Pontifical Council for "Christian Unity") actually agreed that, owing to "radically altered perspectives and thus attitudes"

¹⁹¹ (Emphasis added.) *Service International de Documentation Judéo-Chrétienne* (SIDIC), Rome, [English edition from Washington, D.C.] Vol. XXXII, No. 3, 1999, p. 22.

¹⁹² The verbal ambiguity used by Vatican II to advance this false notion is found in *Lumen Gentium* 8 wherein it says "The Church of Christ subsists in the Catholic Church" rather than Pope Pius XII's definition that the Church of Christ is the Catholic Church [*Mystici Corporis*, Pope Pius XII]. See previous discussion and footnotes in this chapter concerning the origin and effect of this ambiguity, as admitted by the then-Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger.

¹⁹³ For a brief account of Father Popian's story, see "Vatican says, Do Not Convert to Catholicism", John Vennari, *Catholic Family News*, December 2001. See also "Vatican says, 'You Must Not Become Catholic!'", John Vennari, *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue 69, Winter 2002. Father Popian's testimony on audio cassette entitled "Vatican's Ostpolitik and Ecumenism Tried to Prevent My Conversion to Catholicism" is also available from the Fatima Center, 17000 State Route 30, Constable, New York 12926.

¹⁹⁴ "We are a Sign of Contradiction", interview with Bishop Bernard Fellay, SSPX, *Latin Mass Magazine*, Fall 2001, p. 11.

engendered by Vatican II, the Catholic Church will train new priests “to pave the way for future relations between the two churches, passing beyond *the outdated ecclesiology of return to the Catholic Church*.”¹⁹⁵

The claim that the Magisterium’s constant teaching on the return of the dissidents (heretics and schismatics) to the one true Church as the only means of true Christian unity is now “outdated ecclesiology” is a heresy, since it flatly contradicts not only the Church’s teaching on the return of the dissidents, but also the infallibly defined Catholic dogma that *outside* the Church there is no salvation.

The *de facto* abandonment of the Church’s traditional teaching on this matter does not represent true charity toward the separated brethren but rather a retreat from the Church’s duty to tell them the simple truth. Again, the result is no boon to non-Catholics, but rather a weakened, scandal-ridden Church which, in parts of the world, is hardly able to serve as the leaven of society it was meant to be. While the Church, being a divine as well as a human institution, will inevitably be restored to Her former vigor, as She has following other crises in Her past, the Church and the world will undergo great suffering until this crisis of faith is ended.

The Social Kingship of Christ Abandoned

As a consequence of the Church’s new orientation since Vatican II, there has also been a *de facto* abandonment of the Church’s constant teaching on the Social Kingship of Christ. According to this teaching, not only individual men, but all nations, are obliged to submit to Christ and conform themselves to His teaching. It is the teaching of Christ, not “dialogue” with unbelievers, that will bring peace to the world; it is His Church that must serve as the chief instrument of world peace. The constant teaching of the Church on this doctrine is summed up with admirable concision by Pope Pius XI in his encyclical *Ubi Arcano Dei*:

Since the Church is the safe and sure guide to conscience, for to Her safekeeping alone there has been confided the doctrines and the promise of the assistance of Christ, She is able not only to bring about at the present hour a peace that is truly the peace of Christ, but can, *better than any other agency which We know of*, contribute greatly to the securing of the same peace for the future, to making war impossible in the future. For the Church teaches (*She alone* has been given by God the mandate and the right to teach with authority) that not only our acts as individuals *but also as groups and as nations* must conform to the eternal law of God. In fact, it is much more important that the acts of a nation follow God’s law, since on the nation rests a much greater responsibility for the consequences of its acts than on the individual. *When, therefore, governments and nations follow in all their activities, whether they*

¹⁹⁵ Balamand Statement, nn. 13 and 30. The Balamand Statement (1993) was cited approvingly by Pope John Paul II in *Ut Unum Sint*, n. 59.

*be national or international, the dictates of conscience grounded in the teachings, precepts, and example of Jesus Christ, and which are binding on each and every individual, then only can we have faith in one another's word and trust in the peaceful solution of the difficulties and controversies which may grow out of differences in point of view or from clash of interests.*¹⁹⁶

Speaking of efforts to obtain world peace through a League of Nations, Pope Pius XI declared:

An attempt in this direction has already and is now being made; its results, however, are almost negligible and, especially so, as far as they can be said to affect those major questions which divide seriously and serve to arouse nations one against the other. *No merely human institution of today can be as successful in devising a set of international laws which will be in harmony with world conditions as the Middle Ages were in the possession of that true League of Nations, Christianity.* It cannot be denied that in the Middle Ages this law was often violated; still it always existed as an ideal, according to which one might judge the acts of nations, and a beacon light calling those who had lost their way back to the safe road.¹⁹⁷

In order to reinforce this teaching, Pope Pius XI inaugurated the Feast of Christ the King with his encyclical *Quas Primas*:

It was surely right, then, in view of the common teaching of the sacred books, that the Catholic Church, which is the kingdom of Christ on earth, destined to be spread among all men and all nations, should with every token of veneration salute Her Author and Founder in Her annual liturgy as King and Lord, and as King of kings. ... [T]he empire of our Redeemer embraces all men. To use the words of Our immortal predecessor, Pope Leo XIII: "His empire includes not only Catholic nations, not only baptized persons who, though of right belonging to the Church, have been led astray by error, or have been cut off from Her by schism, but also all those who are outside the Christian faith; so that truly the whole of mankind is subject to the power of Jesus Christ." *Nor is there any difference in this matter between the individual and the family or the State; for all men, whether collectively or individually, are under the dominion of Christ.*¹⁹⁸

The "Civilization of Love" Replaces the Conversion of Pagans

After Vatican II, however, the Social Kingship of Christ was replaced by something called the "civilization of love"—a term coined by Pope Paul VI to describe the utopian notion that "dialogue with the world"

¹⁹⁶ Pope Pius XI, *Ubi Arcano Dei*, Encyclical Letter on the Peace of Christ in His Kingdom, December 23, 1922.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁸ Pope Pius XI, *Quas Primas*, Encyclical on the Kingship of Christ, December 11, 1925.

would lead to a world brotherhood of religions that would not at all be explicitly Christian. The slogan “civilization of love” has been repeated incessantly since then. As Pope John Paul II described this novel notion in his address for the World Day of Peace in 2001:

Dialogue leads to a recognition of diversity and opens the mind to the mutual acceptance and genuine collaboration demanded by the human family’s basic vocation to unity. As such, dialogue is a privileged means for building *the civilization of love and peace* that my revered predecessor Paul VI indicated *as the ideal* to inspire cultural, social, political and economic life *in our time*. . . . *The different religions too can and ought to contribute decisively to this process*. My many encounters with representatives of other religions—I recall especially the meeting in Assisi in 1986 and in Saint Peter’s Square in 1999—have made me more confident that mutual openness between the followers of the various religions can greatly serve the cause of peace and *the common good of the human family*.¹⁹⁹

Even John Paul II was led to think that interreligious prayer meetings such as those at Assisi in 1986 and 2002 are among the very means by which this utopian notion is supposed to be realized. Yet the mere sight of such spectacles would have horrified Pope Pius XII and every one of his predecessors. Meanwhile, the Social Kingship of Christ in a Catholic social order is *de facto* excluded from the new orientation.

Nor has the situation improved with the publication of Pope Benedict’s encyclical *Caritas in Veritate* (2009), which seeks to address the crisis in Western civilization but says not one word about the Social Kingship of Jesus Christ, calling instead for “a new humanistic synthesis.” Consider that Pope Pius XI’s first encyclical on the Church’s answer to the civilizational crisis, *Ubi Arcano*, is subtitled “On the Peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ,” whereas Pope Benedict’s encyclical on the same crisis 87 years later is subtitled “On Integral Human Development in Charity and Truth.” The radical change of terminology from simple Gospel clarity to trendy jargon is as unsettling as it is revealing.

In what is clearly an effort to reconcile the novelties of Vatican II and its “opening to the world” with traditional Church teaching, *Caritas* wavers between “integral human development” as made possible only by divine grace, supernatural charity, Christian fraternity, and the Gospel as “fundamental” and “indispensable”—an indirect affirmation of the Social Kingship—and “integral human development” based on “fundamental values,” “universal values” and “reason open to transcendence,” all of which **seem** to be presented as available to non-Catholics and even non-believers of “good will.”²⁰⁰ (But if they are of good will they must therefore come to be believing Catholics at some point.) Nowhere does the encyclical state clearly (although it faintly

¹⁹⁹ (Emphasis added.) Pope John Paul II’s Message for World Day of Peace, January 1, 2001, “Dialogue Between Cultures for a Civilization of Love and Peace”.

²⁰⁰ Cf. *Caritas*, nn. 55-57.

implies) what Pius XI and his predecessors affirmed explicitly: that *only* the Catholic Church can bring true peace, justice and charity to the world by uniting mankind in one faith and one baptism under Christ the King; that *only* Christendom, not any merely human alliance, can save a tottering civilization.

Clearly, Pope Benedict is making an effort to “turn the ship around,” as is obvious with his “liberation” of the traditional Latin Mass from its bogus “prohibition” for forty years. But given the continued influence of the “new orientation” of the Church and the attendant novelties of “ecumenism,” “dialogue,” “interreligious dialogue,” and “collegiality,”—none of which have any binding doctrinal character whatsoever—the Pope evidently feels obliged to refrain from stating the obvious: that the world simply has no hope of averting catastrophe without Christ and His Blessed Mother. Of course, the Church’s new “ecumenical” and “interreligious” orientation cannot possibly be reconciled with the Message of Fatima, which explains why, beginning with Vatican II, an effort has been made to revise the Message, if not bury it completely, in keeping with the “new orientation.”

Must Catholics Accept the New Orientation of the Church?

Catholics are bound to submit to the Church’s dogmatic definitions on faith and morals; as well as to all the ordinary and universal teachings of the whole Church on faith and morals. These established teachings are guaranteed as true and unchangeable by God Himself. Anything that contradicts the infallible teaching of the Church must be rejected. It is clear that Catholics are *not* bound to submit to new attitudes and orientations of liberalized churchmen who are now saying and doing things unheard-of in the Church’s entire history. Thus, Catholics have the right, even the duty, to resist this new orientation arising from the ambiguities of the Council and the opinions of the “new theology”, which conflict with the perennial and infallible Magisterium.

For years, Catholics have labored under the misconception that they must accept the *pastoral* Council, Vatican II, with the same assent of faith that they owe to dogmatic Councils. This, however, is not the case. The Council Fathers repeatedly referred to Vatican II as a *pastoral* Council. That is, it was a Council that dealt not with *defining* the Faith, but with measures in the realm of practical and prudential judgment—such as the launching of the “ecumenical venture.” The Council’s own document, the Preliminary Note (in Latin, *Nota Praevia*) to *Lumen Gentium*, states this clearly: “In view of the conciliar practice and *pastoral purpose* of the present Council, the sacred Synod defines matters of faith and morals as binding on the Church only when the Synod itself openly declares so.”²⁰¹ No matters of faith and morals were

²⁰¹ Addenda to *Lumen Gentium*, Explanatory Note of the Theological Commission, in Walter M. Abbott, S.J., ed., *The Documents of Vatican II*, (New York: America Press, 1966) pp.

defined “as binding on the Church” concerning the new “ecumenical orientation”, nor as to any of the other novel “pastoral” formulations in the language of the conciliar documents.

That Vatican II was inferior in authority to a dogmatic council is confirmed by the testimony of the Council Father, Bishop Thomas Morris. At his own request, this testimony was not unsealed until after his death:

I was relieved when we were told that this Council was not aiming at defining or giving final statements on doctrine, because a statement on doctrine has to be very carefully formulated and I would have regarded the Council documents as tentative and liable to be reformed.²⁰²

Then there is the important testimony from the Council’s Secretary, Archbishop (later Cardinal) Pericle Felici. At the close of Vatican II, the bishops asked Archbishop Felici for that which the theologians call the “theological note” of the Council—that is, the doctrinal “weight” of its teachings. Archbishop Felici replied:

In view of conciliar practice and the pastoral purpose of the present Council, this sacred Synod defines matters of faith or morals as binding on the Church only when the Synod itself openly declares so.²⁰³

He also said:

We have to distinguish according to the *schemas* and the chapters those which have already been the subject of dogmatic definitions in the past; **as for the declarations which have a novel character, we have to make reservations.**²⁰⁴

Pope Paul VI himself observed that “Given the Council’s pastoral character, it avoided pronouncing in an extraordinary manner, dogmas endowed with the note of infallibility.”²⁰⁵

Thus, unlike a dogmatic Council, Vatican II does not demand an unqualified assent of faith. The Council’s verbose and ambiguous documents are not on a par with the doctrinal pronouncements of past councils. Vatican II’s novelties are not unconditionally binding on the faithful, nor did the Council itself ever say that they were.

And yet the ambiguous teachings of the Council, and the Church’s new post-conciliar orientation, have resulted in nothing less than what, as we shall see, the then-Cardinal Ratzinger called the “demolition of bastions” in the Church. This would include demolition of the Message of Fatima. As we will now demonstrate, this destructive undertaking has

97-98.

²⁰² Bishop Morris’ personal testimony reported in an article by Kieron Wood, *Catholic World News*, January 22, 1997.

²⁰³ *The Documents of Vatican II*, Editor Walter Abbott, S.J., p. 98.

²⁰⁴ Cited from *Open Letter to Confused Catholics*, p. 107.

²⁰⁵ Pope Paul VI, General Audience of January 12, 1966, in *Insegnamenti di Paolo VI*, vol. 4, p. 700, cited from Atila Sinke Guimarães, *In the Murky Waters of Vatican II*, (Metairie, Louisiana: Maeta, 1997; Rockford, Illinois: TAN, 1999) pp. 111-112.

largely fulfilled the dreams of the Church's enemies, and the prophetic warnings of the Message of Fatima as reported by Pope Pius XII only 31 years before the Council.



In the late 1950s, Hans Urs von Balthasar was considered so doctrinally unsound that the Swiss bishops did not allow him to be a theological advisor at Vatican II.