

Chapter 7

The Demolition of Bastions

No wonder the Church's worst enemies have been so delighted with the Council and the radical changes it introduced. They are also no doubt quite pleased with the sudden and catastrophic ecclesial collapse in every department following Vatican II. Every available statistic shows that the unprecedented changes ushered in by Vatican II have been accompanied by equally unprecedented declines in the number of priests and religious, the number of new ordinations, the number of seminarians and the number of conversions and baptisms. Immediately after Vatican II some *50,000 priests defected*, and in 2009 there remain approximately 50,000 fewer Catholic priests than there were *forty-four years ago*. In 1997 there were fewer baptisms in the United States than there were in 1970.²⁰⁶

Long before he became Pope, the former Cardinal Ratzinger spoke of "*a continuing process of decay* that has gone on largely on the basis of appeals to the Council, and thus has discredited the Council in the eyes of many people."²⁰⁷ Yet Cardinal Ratzinger, along with the others who have presided over the new orientation of Vatican II, insisted that we need not less, but more of the same:

Does this mean the Council itself must be revoked? Certainly not. It means only that the real reception of the Council has *not yet even begun*. What devastated the Church after the Council was not the Council but the refusal to accept it. ... The task, therefore, is not to suppress the Council but to *discover the real Council* and to deepen its *true intention* in the light of present experience.²⁰⁸

Going even further, and citing as his authority one of the same neo-modernist theologians who have helped produce this disaster for the Church, the then-Cardinal Ratzinger declared:

The fact is, as Hans Urs von Balthasar pointed out as early as 1952, that ... She [the Church] must relinquish many of the things that have hitherto spelled security for Her and that She has taken for granted. *She must demolish longstanding bastions* and trust solely the shield of faith.²⁰⁹

²⁰⁶ See, e.g., statistical analysis of the priesthood in *L'Osservatore Romano*, 13/20 August 1997, and "The Index of Leading Catholic Indicators," *The Latin Mass*, Winter 2000, presenting extensive data from the Vatican *Statistical Yearbook of the Church* and other standard reference works. See also Kenneth C. Jones, *The Index of Leading Catholic Indicators: The Church Since Vatican Council II* (Fort Collins, Colorado: Roman Catholic Publishing, 2003).

²⁰⁷ Cardinal Ratzinger, *Principles of Catholic Theology*, p. 391.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 390.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 391.

The former Cardinal's call for "demolition of longstanding bastions" in the Church was and still is perhaps the most serious admission of all concerning the revolutionary new orientation of the Church brought on by the Second Vatican Council. For what could he mean by "longstanding bastions" if not the Church's traditional defenses against Her enemies—what the then-Cardinal himself described as "many of the things that have hitherto spelled *security* for Her and that She has taken for granted"? The Cardinal appeared to admit that he wished to *demolish* the very things that give the Church security! The Church must, in the Cardinal's apparent view of things, trust "solely in the shield of faith." But what does *that* mean? How can Catholics hold on to their faith unless it is kept secure by the very bastions that are being called to be demolished?

By citing "new theologian" Hans Urs von Balthasar as his authority for this "demolition of bastions", the then-Cardinal appeared to bless the "new theology" that tears down the Church's traditional theology, with its clear and precise definitions of the truths that Catholics must believe. In the former Cardinal's call to *demolish* the Church's "longstanding bastions", we see clearly what can only be called a "desire to destroy." That phrase is taken from a book by the Catholic writer Atila Sinke Guimarães, entitled *Animus Delendi* (Latin for "the desire to destroy"). Guimarães shows that the conciliar and post-conciliar "reformers" of the Church are motivated by a mentality that sees the destruction of the "old" Church as "tragic but necessary" for the Church's "growth and renewal" in the "modern world."

How are the "bastions" to be demolished? Our Lady says the *dogma* of Faith will be preserved in Portugal. Dogmas are in themselves bastions of the Church. Obviously, then, the demolition of bastions will involve the undermining of dogmatic definitions, even as lip-service is paid to the dogmas by the neo-modernist "new theologians" who are doing the undermining. Dogmas can be undermined in these ways: 1) simply ignore them, and they will cease to exist for all practical purposes; 2) replace clear terms with ambiguous terms—e.g. "is" with "subsist"; 3) dismiss dogma as "outdated theology", as in the Balamand Declaration and the various remarks of high-ranking churchmen cited in the preceding chapter; 4) pretend there is no such thing as infallible dogmatic definitions which every Catholic must believe, just as they are written; 5) pretend that defined Catholic dogma can and does change over time; and 6) where the dogma of no salvation outside the Church is concerned, simply refer incessantly to non-Catholics as "believers" or "Christians."

What precisely are the bastions that in the view of "reformers" must be demolished? We recall once again what Pope Pius XII accurately predicted in his inspired comments about the coming crisis in the Church:

I am worried by the Blessed Virgin's messages to Lucy of Fatima. This persistence of Mary about *the dangers which menace the Church* is a divine warning against the suicide of altering the Faith, in Her *liturgy*, Her *theology*, and Her *soul*. ... I hear all around me innovators who wish to *dismantle* the Sacred Chapel, *destroy* the universal flame of the Church, *reject* Her ornaments and make Her feel remorse for Her historical past.

Pius XII identified three elements of the Church that the "innovators" wished to alter: Her liturgy, Her theology and Her soul (i.e. Her very nature). Notice that Pope Pius XII, basing himself on the Fatima Message, as well as what he had witnessed personally in the Church at that time, spoke of a coming attempt to *dismantle*, *destroy* and *reject* these things in the Church. In other words, the "demolition of bastions."

The Demolition of the Liturgy

Before Vatican II the Popes unanimously defended the Church's ancient Latin liturgy against innovation, recognizing that the immutable Latin language was a barrier against heresy, as Pope Pius XII taught in his monumental encyclical on the liturgy, *Mediator Dei*. Indeed, the Protestant "reformers" of the 16th Century hated nothing more than the traditional Catholic Mass in Latin, the Damasian-Gregorian liturgy which was the center of the life of the Church from at least the 4th Century (and probably earlier) until the liturgical "reform" of Pope Paul VI in 1969.

Nowhere can the desire to destroy, the demolition of bastions, be seen more clearly than in Pope Paul's explanation of his decision to suppress the traditional Latin Mass of more than 1,500 years' standing and replace it with a newly concocted rite of Mass in the vernacular—a totally unprecedented action his predecessors would have regarded as shocking and unthinkable:

It is here that the greatest newness is going to be noticed, the newness of language. No longer Latin, but the spoken language will be the principal language of the Mass. The introduction of the vernacular will certainly be a great sacrifice for those who know the beauty, the power, and the expressive sacrality of Latin. We are parting with the speech of the Christian centuries; *we are becoming like profane intruders in the literary preserve of sacred utterance*. We will lose a great part of that stupendous and incomparable artistic and spiritual thing, the Gregorian chant. We have reason for regret, reason almost for bewilderment. What can we put in the place of that language of the angels? We are giving up something of priceless worth. Why? *What is more precious than these loftiest of our Church's values?*

What indeed *is* more precious than "these loftiest of our Church's values"? According to Paul VI what was more precious was an appeal to "modern man", whom the Pope apparently viewed as so obtuse as to

be unable to make heads or tails of Latin prayers in the Roman Missal, even if the same Missal included vernacular translations alongside the Latin. Paul VI continued by answering his own question:

The answer will seem banal, almost prosaic. Yet it is a good answer because it is human, it is apostolic. Understanding of prayer is more important than the silken garments in which it is royally dressed. Participation by the people is worth more—particularly participation by *modern people*, so fond of plain language which is easily understood and converted into everyday speech.²¹⁰

Paul VI's speech is a blueprint for what has happened to the entire Church since the Council. The conciliar and post-conciliar changes—all without precedent in Church history—are the work of *profane intruders* who labor to destroy something of *priceless worth*, to *demolish bastions* that had been standing for centuries—not only in the sacred liturgy, but in the perennial teaching of the Church. It is no accident that Vatican II caused unprecedented destruction, since the Council's prime movers were planning destruction all along.

Here, however, we can report at least the beginning of a movement toward a restoration since the appearance of the first edition of *The Devil's Final Battle: The Pope's motu proprio* of July 7, 2007, *Summorum Pontificum*, which declared that every priest and religious order in the Church has the right to celebrate the traditional Latin Mass, which was “never abrogated” by Paul VI. In the *motu proprio* and in his letter to the bishops of the world accompanying it, the Pope makes these stunning admissions:

What earlier generations held as sacred, remains sacred and great for us too, and it cannot be all of a sudden entirely forbidden or even considered harmful. It behooves all of us to preserve the riches which have developed in the Church's faith and prayer, and to give them their proper place.²¹¹

As for the use of the 1962 Missal as a *Forma extraordinaria* of the liturgy of the Mass, I would like to draw attention to the fact that this Missal *was never juridically abrogated* and, consequently, in principle, *was always permitted*.²¹²

Never juridically abrogated. *Always permitted*. With these phrases the Pope himself vindicates what “traditionalists” have said all along—

²¹⁰ Audience Address of November 26, 1969.

²¹¹ *Motu proprio Summorum Pontificum* (2007) at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/motu_proprio/documents/hf_ben-xvi_motu-proprio_20070707_summorum-pontificum_lt.html (in Latin); see also http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/letters/2007/documents/hf_ben-xvi_let_20070707_lettera-vescovi_en.html

²¹² Letter of His Holiness Benedict XVI to the Bishops on the Occasion of the Publication of the Apostolic Letter “*motu proprio data*” *Summorum Pontificum* on the Use of the Roman Liturgy Prior to the Reform of 1970, at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/letters/2007/documents/hf_ben-xvi_let_20070707_lettera-vescovi_en.html.

that Paul VI did not, and could not, “ban” the Church’s traditional rite of Mass—and has thus exposed the entire fraud of the “liturgical renewal” following Vatican II. Without any genuine legal authority whatsoever, the traditional Latin Mass was effectively outlawed and the Church’s liturgy turned upside down by the very band of iconoclastic incompetents whose destructive “work” Pius XII foresaw in the light of Fatima.

On this score we have another key admission emerging from “inside the Vatican” since the time of the first edition. In a scathing interview with a pair of traditional Catholic journalists in Italy, Mons. Domenico Bartolucci, no less than the Maestro in perpetuity of the Sistine Chapel under five consecutive Popes and recently honored by Pope Benedict for his long service to the Church in that capacity, was unsparingly, even brutally, frank about the new liturgy and the fraudulent attempt to “forbid” the traditional Mass. Mons. Bartolucci—again, the Maestro of the Sistine Chapel!—revealed that *he had never celebrated the new Mass* but only the traditional Latin Mass, and that “I would on the contrary have found it difficult to celebrate the Mass of the modern rite.” When asked if thoughtful and doctrinally trained people had carried out the “liturgical reform”, Bartolucci gave this withering reply:

Excuse me, but the reform was done by arid people—arid, I repeat to you. And I knew them. As far as doctrine is concerned, I recall that Cardinal Ferdinand Antonelli, of venerable memory, often said: “What are we to make of liturgists who don’t know theology?”²¹³

The Pope’s historic *motu proprio* has to be seen as the fruit of a worldwide Rosary campaign conducted by the allegedly “schismatic” Society of Saint Pius X, which had requested “liberation” of the Latin Mass as a precondition for its discussions with the Vatican concerning the crisis in the Church and the Society’s role in addressing it.

The Society’s defense of Catholic Tradition was validated quite dramatically when the Pope (to howls of outrage from within and without the Church) met the Society’s second precondition by lifting the purported “excommunication” of its four bishops in 1988 with a decree of the Congregation for Bishops issued January 21, 2009 (the Feast of St. Agnes, Virgin and Martyr, in the traditional Roman liturgical calendar). In a letter to the world’s bishops defending his decision to take this step toward “regularizing” the Society, the Pope made perhaps the most devastating admission of all from “inside the Vatican” since this book first appeared:

In our days, when in vast areas of *the world the faith is in danger of dying out like a flame which no longer has fuel*, the overriding priority is to make God present in this world and to show men and

²¹³ “Monsignor Bartolucci on the liturgical reform and the ‘reform of the reform,’” at <http://disputationes-theologicae.blogspot.com/>

women the way to God.²¹⁴

What a comment on the “springtime of Vatican II” that was supposedly inaugurated by the “reforms” of Vatican II! And it is no coincidence that the Pope linked his remark about the sputtering out of faith in vast areas of the world—for *lack of fuel*—to an enumeration of what the Society has to offer the Church: “Can we be totally indifferent about a community which has 491 priests, 215 seminarians, 6 seminaries, 88 schools, 2 university-level institutes, 117 religious brothers, 164 religious sisters and thousands of lay faithful?”

Nor was this just some isolated papal remark. As recently as September 2009 the Pope reiterated the theme of a post-Vatican II disaster in the Church in an address to the Bishops of Brazil during their *ad limina* visit to the Vatican:

Dear Brothers, in the decades following the Second Vatican Council, some have interpreted the opening to the world not as a requirement for the missionary zeal of the Heart of Christ, but as a *passage to secularization*... [C]ertain fundamental truths of the faith, such as sin, grace, theological life, and the last things, were not mentioned anymore.

Many ecclesial communities senselessly fell into self-secularization; attempting to please those who would not come, they witnessed many members whom they had leave them, deceived and disillusioned: those of our time, when they meet us, want to see that which they do not see anywhere else, that is, the joy and hope that come from being with the risen Lord.

There is today a new generation born *into this secularized ecclesial environment*. Instead of noticing an openness and consensus, they see the abyss of differences and contradictions to the Magisterium of the Church growing ever wider, especially in the field of ethics. *In this desert without God*, the new generation feels a deep thirst for transcendence.²¹⁵

So much for “the renewal of Vatican II”! Clearly, the man who is Pope today is not the same man who spoke as Cardinal Ratzinger. He is, rather, a man who, having attained the grace of the papal office, recognizes that enemies of the Faith surround him. As he declared in his first sermon as Pope on April 24, 2005: “Pray for me, that I may not flee for fear of the wolves.” But then Benedict would not be the first Pope to undergo a conservative transformation. No less than Blessed

²¹⁴ Letter of His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI to the Bishops of the Catholic Church Concerning the Remission of the Excommunication of the Four Bishops Consecrated by Archbishop Lefebvre, 10 March 2009, at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/letters/2009/documents/hf_ben-xvi_let_20090310_remissione-scomunica_en.html

²¹⁵ His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI, “To Bishops of the Episcopal Conference of Brazil on their *ad Limina* visit (West 1-2 Regions),” September 7, 2009. For the complete text, see *L'Osservatore Romano*; see also translation at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2009/september/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20090907_ad-limina-brasile_en.html.

Pius IX was a “liberalist” at the beginning of his long pontificate, only to become the archenemy of Liberalism and the “modern world” after he narrowly escaped death and had to flee the papal palace for his life, disguised as a simple priest, when Masonic “patriots” invaded Rome in the name of Liberty.

And yet despite these encouraging signs in the Benedictine pontificate, the crisis in the Church rages on. Even the Pope’s *motu proprio* reduces the received and approved rite of Mass in the Church to “the extraordinary form” of the liturgy, while elevating a new rite concocted less than forty years ago by a committee to the status of “the ordinary form.” This horrible inversion of man-made novelty over a perennial tradition, going back to the Apostles and forged under the influence of the Holy Ghost, is emblematic of precisely that “diabolical disorientation” in the Church of which Sister Lucy spoke again and again in her correspondence and conversations. Further, the *motu proprio*, which clearly enunciates the right of priests to offer the traditional Mass without episcopal permission, is widely ignored and even positively disobeyed by many bishops, who continue to impose ridiculous restrictions on the Church’s own liturgical patrimony.

Then, too, the theological crisis (discussion of which was a third precondition raised by the Society) continues as well. The theological discussions the Society has requested with the Vatican have indeed commenced as this second edition appears. And so it is opportune to restate, in this emerging new context of ever more frank Vatican admissions, the theological concerns we expressed in the first edition.

The Demolition of Theology

In the December 19, 1946 edition of *L’Osservatore Romano*, Pope Pius XII (targeting the heterodox theories of modernists like Chenu and de Lubac) warned that what was being trumpeted as a “new theology” would end up undermining the Faith:

There is a good deal of talk (but without the necessary clarity of concept) about a “new theology”, which must be in constant transformation, following the example of all other things in the world, which are in a constant state of flux and movement, without ever reaching their term. If we were to accept such an opinion, what would become of the unchangeable dogmas of the Catholic Faith; and what would become of the unity and stability of that Faith?²¹⁶

As we have seen, John XXIII disregarded Pope Pius XII’s warning; at Vatican II Pope John rehabilitated the very proponents of the “new theology” who were under suspicion of heresy during the pontificate of Pope Pius XII. To recall the testimony of Msgr. Bandas: “No doubt good Pope John thought that these suspect theologians would rectify

²¹⁶ Quoted from David Greenstock, “Thomism and the New Theology”, *The Thomist*, October 1950.

their ideas and perform a genuine service to the Church. But exactly the opposite happened. ... 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.*"

Now, what have been the effects of the "new theology" upon the Church? Today, in the name of Vatican II, we are told—

- that the Church must dialogue and collaborate with Communists, Muslims, heretics, schismatics, and other real enemies (in the objective order of things) of the faith;
- that the Church's constant pre-conciliar teaching against Liberalism (as seen in the *Syllabus* of Blessed Pius IX) and against Modernism (as seen in *Pascendi* by St. Pius X) is "one-sided" and outdated;
- that the Church must "attempt" a "reconciliation" with the principles of the French Revolution;
- that the "Church of Christ" is larger than the Catholic Church;
- that heretics (e.g. Protestants) and schismatics need no longer convert and return to the Catholic Church for salvation or even for unity.

In short, the Church's enemies in the neo-modernist, Freemasonic and Communist camps have seen their anti-Catholic dreams largely come true.

But now the Vatican seems willing to discuss the resulting theological disaster with the Society of Saint Pius X. No doubt the partisans in the Vatican are intent on inducing the Society to embrace the ambiguous novelties of the Council—which, in fact, no Catholic has any duty to embrace. On the contrary, in fact, all faithful Catholics must resist and reject all errors against the Church's teaching of all time—even if those errors were promoted by a non-infallible Council such as Vatican II. That is because the Church has no power to invent new doctrines.²¹⁷ Nevertheless, some advance is being made because at least now the Vatican is willing to enter into a *discussion* regarding the Council documents instead of demanding a false "obedience" to novel and nebulous concepts that have manifestly provoked tremendous damage to the Church and the cause of the Gospel.

The Demolition of the Church's Soul

The future Pius XII was not speaking idly when, in the light of the Message of Fatima, he predicted the coming attempt to alter not only

²¹⁷ As the *First* Vatican Council declared in its Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ, Ch. 4, § 6: "For the Holy Spirit was promised to the successors of Peter *not so that they might, by His revelation, make known some new doctrine*, but that, by His assistance, they might religiously guard and faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith transmitted by the apostles. Indeed, their apostolic teaching was embraced by all the venerable Fathers and revered and followed by all the holy orthodox Doctors..."

the Church's liturgy and theology, but *Her very soul*—what She *is*. Of course, this design can never succeed completely, because Our Lord promised that the gates of hell would not prevail against His Church. But this divine promise does not exclude the Church's human element suffering the gravest possible wounds from Her enemies, short of a final death. It was the prospect of such grave injuries to the Church that so alarmed Pope Pius XII, especially in light of the Fatima prophecies.

And indeed Pope Pius' worst fears have been realized in the post-conciliar period, in which we have witnessed an effort to change the Church from the sole ark of salvation, outside of which no one is saved, into a mere collaborator with other "churches and ecclesial communities", non-Christian religions and even atheists in building up a utopian "civilization of love." In this "civilization of love" the salvation of souls from hell—which is no longer mentioned—is replaced by a new form of "salvation": salvation through world "brotherhood" and world "peace." This is the very notion which Freemasonry has been promoting for the past three centuries.

In keeping with this Freemasonic notion of "salvation" through the "brotherhood of man" (understood in a secular, non-Christian sense), many Catholic churchmen now tell us that we must respect the various Protestant and schismatic sects as partners in "ecumenical dialogue" and the "search for Christian unity." In keeping with this new notion, there are joint ecumenical "liturgies" between Catholics, Protestants and schismatic Orthodox churches to demonstrate the supposed "partial communion" between "all Christians."

To be sure, the executors of the new orientation of the Catholic Church still allow that She is the most perfect of all churches, but the claim that the Catholic Church *is the one true Church*, to the complete exclusion of all others, has *de facto* been abandoned by all but a remnant of faithful Catholics. Today they are considered "rigid sectarians" and "pre-conciliar" for simply believing what Catholics always believed before 1965. Contrary to the unfortunate, ignorant post-conciliar "Catholics", all Catholics who know the Catholic Faith know that unchangeable Catholic dogma must always be believed in order to remain in the Catholic Church, outside of which there is no salvation.

But the Freemasons and their allies view "Christian unity" as only a step toward pan-religious unity in the world brotherhood. At the same time "Christian unity" is being promoted by pan-Christian activities which the great pre-conciliar Popes would have regarded as sacrileges, "interreligious dialogue" has made the Church more "open" to the "value" of non-Christian religions, whose followers would no longer be regarded as being in need of faith and Baptism to save their souls. Karl Rahner's "anonymous Christianity"—which holds that the sincere followers of any religion can be, and probably are, "Christians" without even knowing it—has become the *de facto* theology of the Church. Accordingly, there would be pan-religious prayer meetings in which

the members of all religions gather together to pray for peace and to demonstrate their “unity” as members of the human family, without any of them being told that they are in danger of damnation without Baptism, faith in Christ and membership in His Church. In the “reformed” Good Friday liturgy, Catholics (for the first time in the Church’s liturgical history) no longer pray publicly and unequivocally for the conversion of non-Catholics into the Catholic Church as a necessary step for the salvation of their souls.

As anyone can see, the replacement of the Social Kingship of Christ with the “civilization of love” has totally neutralized the Catholic Church, which no longer serves as the center of the world’s moral and spiritual authority, as She was meant to be by Her divine Founder.

The progressivist theologians who advanced this new orientation of the Church have now formed almost two generations of Catholic laity and clergy. The works of Rahner, Küng, Schillebeeckx, Congar, de Lubac, von Balthasar, and their disciples now dominate the teaching-texts of Catholic seminaries and universities. For the past 40 years, the progressivist tenets of these men have served as the principal formation for priests, religious, theologians, and Catholic college students. Thus, we have now reached a stage where prelates prefer Rahner’s theology to that of Saint Robert Bellarmine, for example, who is a canonized saint and Doctor of the Church, or Saint Thomas Aquinas, the great Doctor and one of the greatest saints in Church history. The teaching of Bellarmine and Aquinas—indeed, the teaching of all the Popes before Vatican II—tends to be accepted only in accordance with the spin given it by Rahner and the other “new theologians.” The same is true of most professors teaching today in Catholic colleges and seminaries.

This process of attempting to change the very soul and theology of the Church, as Pope Pius XII feared, has involved not only the “ecumenical venture” and “interreligious dialogue”, but also an endless series of apologies from Catholic churchmen, high and low, for the Church’s past “triumphalism” in claiming to be the sole repository of divine revelation, and the supposed sins of Her deceased members against other “Christians” and other cultures. This was precisely what Pope Pius XII predicted when he spoke of the innovators who would “make Her [the Church] feel remorse for Her historical past.”

The Enemy’s Predictions Fulfilled

We now summarize the close correspondence between what we have seen happen in the post-conciliar Church and the goals of both Freemasonry (as revealed by Roca and various Freemasons, many quoted by Bishop Graber, and *The Permanent Instruction*) and Communism (as attested to by Bella Dodd and other ex-Communists):

- The radical revision of the Roman liturgy following an ecumenical council. (Roca)

- An accord between “the ideals of modern civilization and the ideal of Christ and His Gospel. This will be the consecration of the New Social Order and the solemn baptism of modern civilization”—that is, the overall liberalization of Catholic churchmen in accordance with the same false principles condemned in the *Syllabus* of Blessed Pius IX. (Roca, Melinge, *The Permanent Instruction of the Alta Vendita*)
- The emergence of a “pluri-confessional pontificate, able to adapt to a polyvalent ecumenism, such as we are seeing established today in the intercelebration of priests and Protestant pastors”—Pope John Paul II himself celebrated joint liturgies with Protestant clerics.²¹⁸ (Roca, Melinge)
- The introduction of a “*guilt complex into the Church ... to label 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.*” (Dodd)
- The “opening up” of the Church to the world and to a more “flexible” attitude toward all religions and philosophies. (Dodd)
- The use of this new orientation to undermine the Church, without actually destroying the exterior appearance of it. (Dodd, the Soviet defectors and *The Permanent Instruction*)

And yet—we must stress once again—all of these developments were predicted by the future Pope Pius XII in remarks he related specifically to “the Blessed Virgin’s messages to Lucy of Fatima” and “this persistence of Mary about the dangers which menace the Church.”

The Passion of the Church

Thus, the passion that our Holy Church is presently suffering is really no great mystery. By ignoring, shunning, despising Our Lady of Fatima and Her prophetic message of warning and Her offering us the only way out of this crisis as well as by recklessly ignoring the Popes of the past, by abandoning condemnations of error, by “rehabilitating” suspect theologians and making them heroes of the Church, by abolishing the *Index of Forbidden Books* and the Holy Office, by doing away with the traditional Catholic liturgy which was a barrier against heresy, by pronouncing the anti-liberal teaching of Blessed Pius IX and the anti-

²¹⁸ For example see: “Joint Catholic-Lutheran Vespers at Vatican”, CWNews.com, November 13, 1999: “Archbishops G.H. Hammar and Jukka Paarma—the Lutheran primates of Sweden and Finland, respectively—and Bishops Anders Arborelius of Stockholm and Czeslaw Kozon of Copenhagen joined with the Holy Father for the Vespers service. Several other Lutheran ‘bishops’ from the Scandinavian countries were present for the ceremony, including two female ‘bishops’.” Likewise, at the beginning of the Jubilee Year, Pope John Paul II opened the Holy Doors of Saint Paul Outside the Walls with Anglican Archbishop Carey and schismatic Metropolitan Athanasios. Representatives of 20 other false confessions attended the ecumenical ceremony. See “Non-Catholics Joining Pope in Rite”, *Los Angeles Times*, January 19, 2000.

modernist teaching of Saint Pius X as “one-sided” and “outdated”—in short, by ruthlessly and systematically stripping the Church of almost all Her defenses—our present Church leaders have demolished nearly all the bastions that once protected the Church from infiltration and corruption, thus creating a compromised structure that we can now see collapsing in scandal, corruption, disobedience, and loss of faith.

Yet some Church leaders continue to insist that the disastrous process of change responsible for this *admitted* invasion and auto-demolition of the Church be continued full steam ahead. This is precisely why the then-Cardinal Ratzinger, many years after Vatican II, declared that the Church “must demolish longstanding bastions.”²¹⁹

As we have already demonstrated, all of this was predicted by the Church’s enemies. Bishop Graber, commenting on the post-conciliar crisis in light of the Masons’ own predictions of what they would soon succeed in doing, declared:

*If in the face of these unambiguous admissions [by Masons, etc.] anyone still holds to the opinion that the events in the Church [since Vatican II] are marginal phenomena or transitional difficulties which will die down of their own accord in time, he is simply beyond hope. But all the greater is the responsibility of the leading men in the Church if they do not occupy themselves with these questions and imagine that everything can be repaired by patching it up here and there.*²²⁰

But it is these very “leading men of the Church” who are the subject of our case. Yet we hasten to say, once again, that we do not claim that every churchman who promotes novel practices, such as ecumenism, is deliberately acting as an enemy of the Church. The renowned priest of the 19th Century, Father Frederick Faber, was a true prophet when he said in a remarkable sermon preached at Pentecost, 1861 in the London Oratory:

We must remember that if all the manifestly good men were on one side and all the manifestly bad men were on the other, there would be no danger of anyone, least of all the elect, being deceived by lying wonders. It is the good men, once good, we must hope good still, who are to do the work of anti-christ and so sadly to crucify the Lord afresh ... ***Bear in mind this feature of the last days, that this deceitfulness arises from good men being on the wrong side.***²²¹

As we will proceed to prove, the men who concern us *are* on the wrong side. In their “demolition of bastions” in the Catholic Church through the imposition of their new orientation—or what has been called the Council’s “attempt at an official reconciliation” with “the

²¹⁹ Cardinal Ratzinger, *Principles of Catholic Theology*, 1987.

²²⁰ Graber, *Athanasius and the Church of Our Time*, pp. 170-171.

²²¹ Quote taken from *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Father Denis Fahey, (Regina Publications, Dublin, first printed in 1935) p. xi.

new era” begun by the French Revolution—they have necessarily arrayed themselves against the Message of Fatima. For there is nothing more integrally Catholic, nothing more opposed to the spirit of “the new era”, nothing more inimical to the conciliar ecumenism, nothing more opposed to the tearing down of Catholic bastions, than the Virgin Mary’s call for the consecration of Russia to Her Immaculate Heart, Russia’s consequent conversion to the Catholic Faith, and the glorious triumph of the Immaculate Heart throughout the world in a Catholic social order.

The Message of Fatima: A Final Bastion

From what we have said thus far it should be apparent that the Message of Fatima, in its sheer Catholic integrity, cannot coexist with the new vision of the Church foisted upon us by those with a “desire to destroy” through the “demolition of bastions.” This destruction has happened precisely because the vast program of Vatican II’s *aggiornamento* runs contrary to the Catholic truths that permeate the Fatima Message.

Our Lady did not come to Fatima to demolish bastions in the Church, but rather to exhort the members of the Church to defend Her bastions in the coming crisis. She did not preach “ecumenism” or “interreligious dialogue”, but the constant and unchanging teaching of the Church: that there is no salvation outside Her. When Our Lady came to Fatima, She did not give us any “new theology”; nor did She give us any “new understanding” of doctrine that would conflict in any way with the constant teaching of the Magisterium.

What do we see in the Message of Fatima? We see the key doctrines of our Faith reinforced, the very doctrines that have come under the fiercest attack in our time.²²² When the Mother of God came to Fatima—

- She spoke of the doctrine of Heaven;
- She spoke of the doctrine of Hell;
- She showed the children Hell;
- She spoke of the doctrine of Purgatory;
- She spoke of the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist;
- She spoke of the doctrine of the Sacrament of Penance.
- And She also spoke, indirectly, of the Social Kingship of Jesus Christ when She conveyed Heaven’s command that Russia be consecrated to Her Immaculate Heart and *converted* to the fervent practice of the Catholic religion, which would lead to true, lasting peace in the

²²² For further considerations on the fact that Our Lady of Fatima reinforced key Catholic doctrines that are denied today, see John Vennari, “A World View Based on Fatima”, *The Fatima Crusader*, Spring 2000, Issue 64; also available on the web (in booklet form) at <http://www.fatimacruzader.com/aworldview/tocaworldview.asp>. For a free copy of this article, write to the publisher of this book (see page xxvi).

world. This peace cannot come except through Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace. And it cannot exist unless we build upon His social doctrine for peace and justice—unless nations live the moral teaching of Jesus Christ. But they cannot do that unless they accept His grace through the Sacraments.

A Motive Clearly Exposed

In conclusion, for those who unswervingly pursue the plainly ruinous “new orientation” of the Church, the Message of Fatima can only represent another bastion that must be demolished. That is why, as Pope Pius XII revealed in his prophetic remarks, the Virgin’s messages to Sister Lucy concerned “the dangers which menace the Church.” Although it is not revealed in those portions of the Message of Fatima that we have thus far been allowed to see, Pius XII spoke of “a divine warning” at Fatima about the “innovators all around me” who would bring grave harm to the Church through the alteration of the faith, “in Her liturgy, Her theology and Her soul.”

We now see, clearly exposed, the motive for the crime which is the subject of this book. *There is a fundamental opposition between the “new” Church ushered in by Vatican II and the Church of all time, as represented by the Message of Fatima.* The Message of Fatima is a heavenly roadblock in the path of those who are determined to bulldoze the bastions of the old Church so that they can erect a new, more “enlightened” Church on the rubble.

These two competing visions of the Church—the vision of a “new” Church and the vision of the Church of all time as seen at Fatima—cannot coexist. One vision must yield to the other. The men who are the subject of this book have (explicitly or implicitly) made their choice concerning which vision of the Church must, to their way of thinking, govern. They have chosen the new vision—the new orientation of the Church initiated at Metz and at Vatican II. *In that choice lies their motive, and in that motive lies our understanding of their otherwise inexplicable actions against the Message of Fatima.*

Putting aside for the moment the question of the subjective motives of the proponents of this new orientation—who speak for themselves in the statements we have presented—it cannot be denied that objectively their actions are scandalous, suicidal to the Church (in a relative sense, of course) and harmful to millions of souls. Thus, their actions constitute a grave injustice no matter what the perpetrators may intend subjectively, because one can commit a veritable crime against the Church through recklessness or culpable negligence without consciously intending harm. For just as a man who sincerely believes it is right to murder someone is nonetheless guilty of murder, so are those who have harmed the Church—even with the best of intentions—guilty of a crime against Her. It is the difference between what the law calls a specific intent to

cause harm to another, and a general intent to do an act that one should know will cause harm, even if one does not subjectively intend harm. In other words, the law punishes deliberate acts committed by one who should have known better than to commit the act.

For some of those responsible for this disaster, it may be a misguided sense of “enlightenment”—“doing evil under the guise of good” or a “diabolical disorientation” in the leadership of the Church, to quote the words of Sister Lucy herself. With these men, it is a case of “blind men guiding other blind men” as Sister Lucy said,²²³ referring to what Jesus said in the Gospel (Mt. 15:14), “the blind leading the blind.” It is also a case of the blind refusing to admit that they are blind. Some of these men may, in fact, have convinced themselves that what they are doing is best for the Church, even though it is manifestly ruinous.

In any case, we will show that the identified Vatican prelates are, objectively speaking, guilty of a terrible and grave injustice against the Church and the world through their participation in what is nothing short of a conspiracy to frustrate the fulfillment of the authentic Message of Fatima. Let God be the judge of their souls. Their objective words and deeds, however, judge themselves in the external forum of history.

What is more, the actions of these men can be judged by the light of the Church’s own infallible teaching. The results of this departure from infallible teachings are evil, as the current condition of the Church should demonstrate to anyone. Catholics must judge an evil to be evil when they see it, rather than pretending it is good merely because certain figures in authority insist it is good. “Woe to you that call evil good, and good evil.” (Isaias 5:20).

And so now we see, fully and clearly exposed, the motive that has animated the recent efforts by the Vatican apparatus to bury the Message of Fatima once and for all. For Fatima is the sum and substance of all the bastions they seek to demolish.

²²³ See *The Whole Truth About Fatima* - Vol. III, pp. 750-762.



Vladimir Lenin, the evil genius behind the Communist Revolution in Russia in 1917, without whom, historians agree, the Russian Revolution would not have succeeded. Two foundational principles for establishing and expanding the Communist world revolution, according to Lenin himself, are the principle of terrorism (strategically used) as well as the principle that “the lie is sacred”. In other words, Lenin taught that whenever lying advances the Communist Revolution in whatever circumstances a Communist agent (or agents) finds himself in, then it is, according to Lenin, his sacred duty to lie. But because people can know when they’re being lied to, if the first lie told by agent #1 does not agree with the second lie told by agent #2, Lenin came up with the need for a common lie that all agents would repeat so as to be consistent to the general public. That common lie is known as “the Party Line”. This is further explained in the following chapter, where it is also explained how there is a “Party Line” used inside the Catholic Church to destroy Fatima.