

THE ENEMY IS HERE

VOLUME III

by

Hutton Gibson

www.HuttonGibson.com

THE WAR IS NOW! No. 60, December 2003

“Bishop” Fiorenza on the Mass? Texas Catholic Herald, 9/12/2003

Thuc’s Defender’s Reaction to The War Is Now! # 56

The War Is Now! # 61 May 2004

Do American bishops believe in Purgatory? Are we one with them in faith?

Paul VI’s Address, United Nations, October, 1965

Humani Generis Redemptionem (On Preaching the Word of God)
Encyclical of Pope Benedict XV June 15, 1917.

The Catholic Encyclopedia (1913) Vol. X, p.23. **Mass**

The War Is Now! # 62 October 2004

Return of the “Scholars”

Help for the Scholars (against *The Passion of the Christ*)

\$\$PX on Sedevacantism

From the 1917-18 Code of Canon Law:

Another Sedevacacantist Bites the Dust? Richard Ibranyi

Strange Effects of *The Passion of the Christ*

Father McBride’s Family Catechism

Absence of Sacred Tradition

The Oratory Catechism

The Oratory Catechism (protracted)

Establishment of Religion

Taming the wild Lingo

Osteo-Betrayal

National Catholic Register that “Cardinal” Walter Kasper

Baptism is a Sacrament

THE WAR IS NOW! No. 64, June 2005 **The Seat is Still Vacant**

Hilaire Belloc: Essays of a Catholic Layman in England (1931) Excerpts:

THE WAR IS NOW! No. 65, September 2005 Excerpts from *Nikita Roncalli*

How long is an interregnum?

Greater Dialogue

The War Is Now! No. 66, December 2005

Argument Corner

THE WAR IS NOW! No. 67, May 2006 In Defense of “Copernican Heretics”

What Price Authority?

An Innovation *Crazy Pages!*

GKKK Kanonization

“Bishop” Williamson Thinks

III. CONDEMNATION OF LIBERALISM BY THE CHURCH

Speaking of Condemned Heresies

THE WAR IS NOW! No. 68, October 2006 **1981 Thuc Consecrations**

Clarence Kelly's **The Sacred and the Profane**

An accountant has decided to charge the usurpers with some of their heresies

THE WAR IS NOW! No. 69, January 2007 No longer will the president misquote Christ

The SSPX Consecrations A CANONICAL STUDY`

\$\$PX spokesmen often derive “proofs” from incomplete quotations

Law promulgated by Pope St. Pius V.

THE WAR IS NOW! No. 71, July 2007 Phony priest

Ratzinger’s opposition to traditional worship confirmed

Genes The Catholic Gene

Il Santo by Antonio Fogazzaro

THE WAR IS NOW! No. 72. October 2007 Yes, Virginia, there is a *Motu Proprio*.

In his book **Faith and the Future Joseph Ratzinger** discusses modern science

Evolution is a *Fait Accompli* to which the Church Must Adapt

THE WAR IS NOW! No. 73, March 2008 **Cultural Currents**, Max Cunningham

Letter to (among others) some of the Roman Curia June 19, 2007

Latest SSPX News from Rome

Ratzinger has opportunely, in time for Holy Week, **addressed the problem of the ages**

Una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro

intended comparison of the 1917 Code of Canon

The Secret Still Hidden, by Christopher Ferrara

THE WAR IS NOW! No. 74 never received a specific answer to a specific question
pamphlet on Holy Orders?

The Church at the Turning Points of History, Godfrey Kurth

Archbishop Malcolm Ranjith Liturgy

Excommunicated, ineligible Usurper Joseph Ratzinger & Knights of Columbus

Argument Corner

Queries for clerics (or for interested parties)

Bishop John Vaughan's Selected Sermons

The virtue of Divine Faith

Easter Sermon

Cana Sermon

THE FATIMA CRUSADER has branched out against Sedevacantism

Siridiocy

A years-too-long tale of a shaky hypothesis

Why Giuffré's Excessive Reaction?

Comment from the Target

Another Target (The Four Marks)

The War Is Now! #76 G. K. Chesterton

St. Patrick's feast has come and gone again

Southern Poverty Law Center's list of anti-Semitic organizations

Man in white yarmilke write with forked computer.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH

The War Is Now! No. 77 September 2009 *Paolo Sesto Beato?*

Retirement

Do we want to win?

Jerusalem — Pilgrim Benedict XVI

Weakland Criminal Rehash – Insufficient Damage?

Reaction to twin! #76

case that Protestants—and postconciliar Catholics—worship another God

Homeland Security Targets

Back to the Minority!

The War Is Now! No. 78 December 2009 ELEISON COMMENTS VALID BISHOPS?

Kyrie eleison. London, England, Achille Lienart

More about Achille Lienart's deathbed confession

SSPX's senior bishop, Richard Williamson

Noa(c)hide Laws

Papal Commission Promotes Noahide Laws

The Seven Noahide Laws

Crux rei What says Ratzl? He has examined the entire Old Testament

Amazing Versatility

VATICAN CITY (Reuters) - Pope Benedict change lifestyles to save planet

Reuters July 7, 2009 Pope Benedict on Tuesday called for a “world political authority

Pope Benedict XVI warns nations against undermining authority of the UN by acting unilaterally

Priestly Ordination Form

The Reform of the Liturgy 1948-1975, Annibale Bugnini

inconceivable that a Catholic properly educated in the Catholic religion

terrible picture of church and secular governments which are out to kill us

From “The Apocalypse of St. John” Written in the 1920s by Fr. E. Sylvester Berry

Vanishing Characteristics of Belief

The diocese of Wilmington, Delaware, declared bankruptcy

new vestment color: “rainbow,” universally associated with the sodomite “gay-pride” movement

'Anglicanorum Coetibus'

Genesis 2:21-24. Then the Lord God cast a deep sleep upon Adam: and when he was fast asleep, he took one of his ribs, and filled up flesh for it. And the Lord God built the rib which he took from Adam into a woman: and brought her to Adam. And Adam said: This now is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man. Wherefore a man shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they shall be two in one flesh.

Matthew 5:31-32. And it hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a bill of divorce. But I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, excepting the cause of fornication, maketh her to commit adultery: and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery.

Matthew 19:3-9. And there came to him the Pharisees tempting him, saying: Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? Who answering, said to them: Have ye not read, that he who made man from the beginning, made them male and female? And he said: For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they two shall be in one flesh. Therefore now they are not two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder. They say to him: Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorce, and to put away? He saith to them: Because Moses by reason of the hardness of your heart permitted you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. And I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery.

Mark 10:2-12. And the Pharisees coming to him asked him, tempting him: Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? But he answering, saith to them: What did Moses command you? Who said: Moses permitted to write a bill of divorce and to put her away. To whom Jesus answering, said: Because of the hardness of your heart, he wrote you that precept. But from the beginning of the creation, God made them male and female. For this cause, a man shall leave his father and mother and shall cleave to his wife. And they two shall be in one flesh. Therefore now they are not two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder. And in the house again his disciples asked him concerning the same thing. And he saith to them: Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another committeth adultery against her. And if the wife shall put away her husband and be married to another, she committeth adultery.

Genesis 13:13. And the men of Sodom were very wicked, and sinners before the face of the Lord beyond measure.

18:20-21. And the Lord said: The cry of Sodom and Gomorrha is multiplied, and their sin is become exceedingly grievous. I will go down and see whether they have done according to the cry that is come to me; or whether it be not so, that I may know.

19:1-28. And the two angels came to Sodom in the evening, and Lot was sitting in the gate of the city. And seeing them, he rose up and went to meet them: and worshipped prostrate to the ground. And said: I beseech you, my lords, turn in to the house of your servant, and lodge there: wash your feet, ... But before they went to bed, the men of the city beset the house, both young and old, all the people together. And they called Lot, and said to him: Where are the men that came in to thee at night? bring them out hither, that we may know them: Lot went out to them, and shut the door after him, and said: Do not so, I beseech you, my brethren, do not commit this evil. ... But they said: Get thee back thither. And again: Thou camest in, said they, as a stranger, was it to be a judge? therefore we will afflict thee more than them. And they pressed very violently upon Lot: and they were even at the point of breaking open the doors. And behold the

men put out their hand, and drew in Lot unto them, and shut the door. And them, that were without, they struck with blindness from the least to the greatest, so that they could not find the door. And they said to Lot: Hast thou here any of thine? son in law, or sons, or daughters, all that are thine bring them out of this city: For we will destroy this place, because their cry is grown loud before the Lord, who hath sent us to destroy them. So Lot went out, and spoke to his sons in law that were to have his daughters, and said: Arise: get you out of this place, because the Lord will destroy this city. And he seemed to them to speak as it were in jest. And when it was morning, the angels pressed him, saying: Arise, take thy wife, and the two daughters that thou hast: lest thou also perish in the wickedness of the city. And as he lingered, they took his hand, and the hand of his wife, and of his two daughters, because the Lord spared him. And they brought him forth, and set him without the city: and there they spoke to him, saying: Save thy life: look not back, neither stay thou in all the country about: but save thy self in the mountain, lest thou be also consumed. ... The sun was risen upon the earth, and Lot entered into Segor. And the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrha brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven. And he destroyed these cities, and all the country about, all the inhabitants of the cities, and all things that spring from the earth. ... And Abraham got up early in the morning, and in the place where he had stood before with the Lord: He looked towards Sodom and Gomorrha, and the whole land of that country: and he saw the ashes rise up from the earth as the smoke of a furnace.

Leviticus 18:22-30. Thou shalt not lie with mankind as with womankind: because it is an abomination. Thou shalt not copulate with any beast: neither shalt thou be defiled with it. A woman shall not lie down to a beast, nor copulate with it: because it is a heinous crime. Defile not yourselves with any of these things with which all the nations have been defiled, which I will cast out before you, and with which the land is defiled: the abominations of which I will visit, that it may vomit out its inhabitants. Keep ye my ordinances and my judgments: and do not any of these abominations. Neither any of your own nation, nor any stranger that sojourneth among you. For all these detestable things the inhabitants of the land have done, that were before you, and have defiled it. Beware then, lest in like manner, it vomit you also out, if you do the like things: as it vomited out the nation that was before you. Every soul that shall commit any of these abominations, shall perish from the midst of his people. Keep my commandments. Do not the things which they have done, that have been before you: and be not defiled therein. I am the Lord your God.

Leviticus 20:13. If any one lie with a man as with a woman, both have committed an abomination: let them be put to death. Their blood be upon them.

CIC 1917-18: Canon 1013 (1) The primary end of marriage is the procreation and education of children; the secondary end, mutual support and the relief of concupiscence.

Comment (Marriage Legislation in the New Code of Canon Law, Ayrinhac & Lydon, Benziger 1943): The procreation and education of children form the primary aim of marriage, which was instituted by the Creator for the propagation of the human race. But mutual support and the appeasement of the passions are ends also, though secondary and subordinate. positive exclusion or even mere ignorance of the primary end would render the marriage null. As long, however, as the primary end is not excluded, marriage contracted for one of the secondary ends, or even for any reasonable motive, is both valid and licit.

Sodomy, or homosexuality, being a sterile perversion, positively excludes the primary end of marriage, and is, considered as a marriage, totally null beforehand.

Marriage, then, is a divine institution for the preservation of the race. It preceded all human propagation and all human institutions and governments. It is both a natural and a supernatural right. No human government is competent to restrict or regulate it, though many tax it by licenses to allow it, and presume to terminate what they do not initiate.

Marriage between baptized Christians is a sacrament, which the spouses confer upon each other. If we are to have what is loosely termed separation of Church and State, whence the State's right

of interference? Whence the logic behind President Bush's call for a Constitutional Amendment to the effect that Marriage shall take place between a man and a woman? Next we shall have an Amendment in support of Webster's Dictionary! Who does not know that marriage is a right that enjoys official protection?

But George W. Bush said that states would be free to vary this natural requirement to accommodate the perversions of sodomites who wish to destroy marriage while claiming the privileges thereof. Several states would undoubtedly further exceed their competence by such variance. This would lead shortly to test cases before the U.S. Supreme Court, which is just as likely to throw out Bush's projected Amendment as it was to enter the moral field and recognize the "right" to kill our unborn offspring. And all marital rights will be thrown out therewith.

The Supreme Court was established to rule on the constitutionality of federal laws. But in *Roe versus Wade* it established a privileged class of mass murderers. What else can we expect? During the Middle Ages, the dramatic representation of the Passion and of the Resurrection of Our Lord was added to the ceremonies of Divine worship, for purposes of instruction and edification. In the thirteenth century, however, this was no longer permitted in the churches, owing to the difficulty of obtaining suitable actors, and to the want of respect for the holy place, too often occasioned by these representations. Moreover, the dramatic performances, also styled Mysteries, soon ceased to be a part of the actual services of the Church. **The language of the people was substituted for the Latin, and the dramas soon lost their religious character altogether.**

"Bishop" Fiorenza on the Mass? Texas Catholic Herald, 9/12/2003

Fiorenza filled most of page 3 with inaccuracies and irrelevancies. Firstly, he called the Mass "Tridentine" because the "ritual" was published in 1570 after the Council of Trent. We are to assume that Pope St. Pius V merely published a new ritual—to forget that he imposed upon the entire Church the oldest Rite in existence and suppressed all Rites less than 200 years old at that time. He further decreed that nothing in his Missal could be heedlessly changed and that no priest could be forced to celebrate Mass with any other Missal for all time.

The Second Vatican Council, writes Fiorenza, authorized a general revision of the Roman Missal in its Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, a document shot through with heedless innovation and heresy, and treating matters utterly outside the competence of either the Second Vatican Council or the men who convoked it. The Second Vatican Council never ordered, authorized, or recommended a new rite of Mass, so Paul VI promulgated a "revised" Roman Missal, containing a new rite which was imposed by "papal" wish, which sufficed to drive out our traditional Mass, instituted by Jesus Christ.

A clearly implied intention of the new rite is that it replace the true Mass, even if only occasionally, breeding doubt and suspicion, to say the least, even without the insuperable obstacles to validity in the new rite's origin (not merely human but heretical) and definition: "The Lord's Supper or the Mass, is the sacred assembly or gathering together of the people of God, with a priest presiding, to celebrate the memorial of the Lord." This definition, though correct on the authority of its authors, was changed to ambiguity to stop the general outcry, but not a word of the rite it defined was changed.

According to Fiorenza: "The revised ritual for the celebration of the Mass in the vernacular has been termed the *Novus Ordo Mass*." The new rite in Latin is called the *novus ordo missae*; in the vernacular it is the New Order of Mass or other vernacular equivalent. This is not accurate: It is not a Mass. It contains none of the three essential parts of the Mass, at which our presence is

required to satisfy our Sunday obligation.

In the new “offertory” we have this bread (this wine) to offer. It will become [will it, now?] the bread of life (our spiritual drink), whatever that means. This is not even equal to burning an ox! We then ask to be received, seemingly as the sacrifice, or part of it, along with this bread and wine to be transmuted into Christ’s Body and Blood much in the manner of the changing of water into wine at Cana. Such an exchange, an ordinary miracle, could be effected, though it is not, by the power of God; but there would exist no connection with Calvary, no victim, no sacrifice, and no need of a priest.

The traditional offertory never mentions bread or wine as offerings.

“Receive, Holy Father, Almighty Eternal God, this spotless Victim”

“We offer Thee, Lord, the chalice of salvation”

We here anticipate the sacrifice, the true and only sacrifice of the New Law, and spell out its meaning. In the Ottaviani Intervention: “Whatever the nature of the sacrifice it is essential that it should be pleasing and acceptable to God, and accepted by Him. In the state of original sin no sacrifice could have any claim to be acceptable. The only sacrifice which has the right to be accepted is that of Christ. In the *novus ordo* the offering is distorted into a sort of exchange of gifts between man and God; man brings bread and God changes it into the ‘bread of life’; man brings wine and God changes it into a ‘spiritual drink.’”

It may be argued that an offertory is unnecessary. But when used it determines the intent of the ceremony.

The Intervention underlines (1) the lack of sufficient reason for a new rite (the modernity of man, which applies equally to every age), (2) the definition of the new mass again and again as a supper, a memorial of the Last Supper, never connected with Calvary, and (3) the removal of the clear intent of the consecration itself—this, mind you, in the Latin! In English we have the further invalidating mistranslation of the words of Christ Himself (*pro multis* = for all men) upon which we must rely for the effect, transubstantiation. Change of the form’s meaning creates change (loss) of effect. The introduction itself of such changes had a predictably divisive effect, and must be considered not less than criminal in intent, even if the changes could have been otherwise valid.

No matter how holy the priest, how strong and orthodox his intention, he cannot overcome the contrary expression of intent in the rite—by definition not a propitiatory sacrifice. No sacrifice, no Mass. No Mass, no Consecration, no Transubstantiation, no Communion—only consumption of bread and wine, exactly what was offered in the Preparation of the Gifts. We know what the Church intends in a Mass. But this *novus ordo* suppresses—therefore denies—the Church’s intention in a ceremony without offertory, consecration, or priest’s communion, the three essential parts of a Mass.

Nor has the *novus ordo*; a consecratory form applied to matter, for the action comes under one or both of these essentials. It has instead a “narrative of institution” just as the Book of Common Prayer or Lutheran service, without prayer, without blessing, without any of the actions of Jesus Christ, Who followed all these, not a mere narrative, with: “As often as ye shall DO these things” If words alone constitute the form, spoken by a priest at Mass in the presence of the matter, would some one care to maintain that a consecration takes place at the Epistle on Holy Thursday, Corpus Christi, and in votive Masses of the Blessed Sacrament, or during the Gospel on Palm Sunday and the following Tuesday and Wednesday? If this type of form, matter, and intention constitute a valid Mass, then a properly ordained priest could use the Lutheran service or the Book of Common Prayer to celebrate a valid Mass. This would, of course, demonstrate faulty

intention to act for the Church, as well as constitute apostasy. So no Catholic could assist.

In the absence of a consecration there can be no communion. We are, therefore, led into idolatry twice at every novus ordo. And the distribution of communion has been integrated into the new mass, along with the priest's communion, to the point where if there is no congregation—a frequent situation during the week—the priest will not celebrate.

Fiorenza then digresses for two columns into his problems with Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre and his Society of St. Pius X. He gratuitously grants that they are validly ordained and that their masses are valid, though they are in schism. It is “morally illicit,” he says, to participate with them. Formerly it was forbidden to apply to schismatics, like the Greek Orthodox, for mass and sacraments (except on our deathbed, in the absence of our own priests.) But if Fiorenza wastes all his space on irrelevancy he need not tackle his real opposition, the traditional Catholic who denies the authority of anyone, especially a pope, to make changes in Catholic doctrine or worship.

For a pope's sworn function, purpose, and obligation is to take everything from his predecessor and to pass it on without increase or decrease to his successor. Four men in a row have sat in the papal chair without even attempting to fulfill this duty. They have replaced the Mass and sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ with substitutes of human origin, therefore incapable of conferring grace, even the grace of Holy Orders. It follows that Fiorenza and most of his Episcopal Conference are not bishops; they were “ordained” with a new and useless “sacrament.”

Fiorenza's third column grants himself permission to grant permission for the Tridentine Mass, “but only on conditions stipulated by the Holy See ...” [What happened to St. Pius V's guarantee?], “that priest and people unambiguously do not question the legitimacy and doctrinal correctness of the Novus Ordo Mass” [promoting idolatry, containing Lutheranism, Judaism, Arianism, and apocatastasis] “promulgated by Pope Paul VI and subsequently confirmed by Pope John Paul II. The priest and people must also affirm the teaching authority of The Second Vatican Council in all its constitutions and decrees. ... The official liturgy of the Church is the Novus Ordo Mass, and it is only by the Indult Ecclesia Dei of Pope John Paul II on July 2, 1988, that an exception can be allowed for the celebration of the Tridentine Mass.” [No, we will be allowed only John XXIII's forbidden 1962 update.]

“In this diocese,” Fiorenza continues, “the Indult Ecclesia Dei is in effect and a Tridentine Mass is offered every Sunday morning” [by a genuinely ordained priest?] “at Annunciation Church in downtown Houston. Mass is also offered in Latin according to the Novus Ordo of The Second Vatican Council on Sunday mornings at Holy Rosary Church and at Annunciation Church.”

He finishes: “It is incumbent on all priests to safeguard the liturgy of the Eucharist, which is Christ's invaluable gift to the Church,” [for preservation, not replacement!] “from deviations to liturgical directives whenever and wherever they celebrate Mass.” [He appears to be trying to preserve the worst deviation from liturgical law in all history—the invaluable gift of Freemason Annibale Bugnini!]

* * * * *

Years are gone since Archbishop Fulton Sheen admonished the laity that as in the fourth century we must save the Church, because clerical hands were tied. At last a layman has taken up the challenge. In an article entitled Timely and Timeless, Bernard Casserly, ex-editor of The Catholic Spirit (St. Paul-Minneapolis archdiocesan rag), identifies a few problems.

Some of Vatican II's 16 documents exceeded the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy in importance, but not in impact on the person in the pew. "The restoration of the vernacular and the virtual disappearance of Latin in the Mass began a wave of changes that has not ebbed." [Latin was once the vernacular, but when were English or any other current vernacular used at Mass? Restoration?] "Our beloved but battered Church has had many councils ... Yet ... there has been nothing like Vatican II in 2000 years. Those fortunate enough to have attended ... would agree. Vatican II is unique in the rich history of the Church." [Though unfortunately absent, I agree!]

Casserly quotes Godfrey Diekman, O.S.B., in a 1992 Washington Theological Union commencement address: "I submit, therefore, that what the Church is suffering now, is a serious case of old-fashioned stomach ache, a case of indigestion. ... we swallowed far too much, and too swiftly, for us to be able to absorb it all peaceably and so we are hurting." Diekman in turn quoted Albert Outlet, a Protestant observer: "I honestly believe that in the whole history of the Christian Church there has never been anything like this. Never such a striking intervention of the Holy Spirit in the affairs of God's people." [So much for subjectivism. What happened at Pentecost?]

"... it is in the liturgy, chiefly the Mass, where God and man come together. And what the people of God want most at Mass is fidelity, not novelty, according to ... Cardinal Francis Arinze, prefect of the Congregation for Divine Worship ... 'What most of the people who come to Mass are asking for is simply that the Mass is there, according to the approved books. The primary thing they are asking for is not something new.' [But the "approved books" are new!]

"We senior Catholics grew up in a Church unique in many ways. It never changed; its Latin liturgy was the same around the globe. All that changed with The Second Vatican Council. That extraordinary assembly must never be forgotten." [Remember the Alamo!—that other great defeat.] "As seniors who have seen and survived the sometimes traumatic changes, we must continue to welcome them, guided by the official statements of the Holy See. Remember, it was that great scholar, Cardinal John Henry Newman, who said, 'Growth is the only evidence of life.' "

[And decay is typical of death. Changes are sometimes traumatic—so let's have more! This is the way to beat off what has shrunk our Church beyond belief and recognition. And this Casserly perceives as growth. That way he can feign happiness with the disastrous results.]
Apparently Archbishop Sheen should have untied his own hands.

* * * * *

A Texas A & M panel claimed to have mastered creation; even to create a man. "You just take a bushel of dirt ..."
"Where'd you get the dirt?"

Thuc's Defender's Reaction to The War Is Now! # 56, (page 2) consisted of a scathing attack on my honesty and objectivity; I never bothered to reply. One would think that I had created the problem. How dare I slander Archbp. Thuc? How dare I question the sanity of this savior of the Catholic Church who had ordained a flock of incompetent, ineligible heretics at Palmar de Troya, and within days consecrated several of them bishops without a papal mandate? Am I a psychiatrist? [Psychiatry was invented by Sigmund Freud, who attributed his own peculiar problems to all humanity.]

But he insisted on a reply, more than once. Eventually I faxed him: July 28, 2003
Last January I received a reaction to my published article on Ngo Dinh Thuc so far over the top, so wild in its charges, so ridiculous that I could see no reason to reply. I asked for comment. The commentator lost it—no great loss.

When I put together my latest book, **The Enemy Is Still Here!**, I included therein the same article to which you so strenuously objected without change.

It has been long established (not merely suspected) that Peter Martin Ngo Dinh Thuc, Titular Archbishop of Bulla Regia, a title accepted from the apostate establishment in Rome, repaired in January 1976 to Palmar de Troya, Spain, where he irresponsibly conferred the sacrament of Holy Orders—top two grades—upon a bevy of strange, untrained, unqualified, venal, notorious heretics, who have since irresponsibly and indiscriminately passed on Orders which they probably never received. When Rome slapped him down, instead of insisting upon his “patriarchal rights,” he bowed to apostate authority and begged its forgiveness, thereby recognizing its dominion over him. He who adheres to an apostate is himself an apostate.

What persuaded him to these unwarranted, unwarrantable, unauthorized ordinations and consecrations? Why did he invest time and energy in travel to this outlandish place? What would make you do such a foolish thing? If it was represented to him, as some say, that the Blessed Virgin wanted him to do this, or that a bi-located Paul VI (the one in the dungeon under the Vatican) had authorized it, why would he not take the sane course? Why would he not ask, as would you or I, for evidence of such orders or permissions? If I am to follow specific orders (not general revelations) of the Blessed Virgin, why has she not told me? If Paul VI had issued multiple mandates for episcopal consecrations, what paralyzed his fine Italian hand that he could not write them down? Whatever the reasons for this outlandish mass violation of Canon Law, where is some semblance of reason? The man performed a whole series of insane actions the sanity of which was further diminished by their sacred field. Who would dare take him seriously in any subsequent ecclesiastical action?

But, you will say, he had the power from Pope Pius XI. So where is his written authority? Where is the plenipotentiary power? For what purpose? In what territory? A pope cannot delegate, for instance, his infallibility. If Ngo Dinh Thuc had such power, why did he not cite it, instead of begging the apostate’s pardon? Nor did he cite any such powers in his eventual statement (“Therefore, *as a bishop* of the Roman Catholic Church, I declare the See of the Catholic Church at Rome vacant, and I must, *as a bishop*, do all things that the Catholic Church of Rome endure for the eternal salvation of souls.”) which came too late to justify his repeated violations of Canon Law. Such justification as he provided long afterward (Is there some doubt about the date?) would necessarily precede the obvious violations. (Or was Thuc divine that he worked in eternity?) Who are you to contradict such an obvious requirement?

According to my records, obtained from Silvio Mattachione, Raymond Maurice Terrason was: (1) ordained priest 12/23/74 by Jean Laborie; who had twice gone outside the Church for consecration before Thuc “consecrated” him 2/8/77; (2) consecrated bishop 3/18/76 by Clemente Dominguez Gomez, a notorious liar and heretic whom Thuc had “consecrated” 1/11/76. □ Terence Dowling was: (1) ordained 6/27/93 by Jean Gerard de la Passion Antoine Laurent Charles Roux whom Thuc had “consecrated” 4/18/92; (2) again ordained 8/??/94 by Raymond Maurice Terrason (consecrated bishop by Clemente Dominguez Gomez); (3) consecrated bishop 8/28/98 by Raymond Maurice Terrason.

Why was Dowling priested twice? Who agreed with me that one ordination was invalid? What made him believe the other valid? There is every reason to doubt both. Either way his consecration is just as doubtful. Any who approach him for mass or sacraments in either capacity run the clear risk of idolatry. There is no possible excuse for running such a risk. Why are you so insistent that others take this terrible risk with you?

You can prove none of your assertions—certainly not that Thuc was sane at all times. It is completely irrelevant that others were also considered insane. There really is such a condition as insanity. As we look at the near universal chaos Thuc created, we can draw no conclusions from actions of such as Judas (roughly 8 % of the Apostles) as to the fruits of the other 92%. Judas

was, as agreed, his own failure, not Christ's. Christ is, in any case, superior to His own words. I will grant that Thuc was manipulated; that does not make him correct. The manipulators knew whom to manipulate. Duress is no reason to sign heresy. It might mitigate the offense in the case of a weak mind. But the offense is denial of Jesus Christ.

You assume that Thuc acted strangely at Vatican II to preserve his life. Could it not be as well assumed that fear for his life had deranged him? It must have been quite a shock to his system when his brothers were killed.

Shock would have been built into attendance at Vatican II. Most of our bishops took leave of their senses there. Disappearance of a threat does not constitute sufficient reason for our enemies to spare anyone. They kill for vengeance, or to create terror.

Plenitudine potestatis Sanctae Sedis Apostolicae deputamus in Nostrum Legatum Petrum Martinum Ngo Dinh Thuc Episcopum titulare Saesinensis ad fines Nobis notos, cum omnibus necessariis facultatibus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die xv mensis Martii MCMXXXVIII Pontificatus Nostri anno septimo decimo.

Finis = limit, boundary, border,

Fines = the limits, boundaries. Also the country itself, a territory, land (within the borders).

Facultas = power, ability, faculty,

Facultates = property, wealth, riches, supplies, resources.

By the fullness of the power of the Holy Apostolic See we depute as Our Legate Peter Martin Ngo Dinh Thuc titular Bishop of Saigon for the territory known to us, with all necessary faculties.

Given at Rome at St. Peter, 15th day of March 1938 in the 17th year of Our Pontificate.

Plenitudine potestatis Sanctae Sedis Apostolicae deputamus in Nostrum Legatum (translated in d'Herbigny's *Motu Proprio* as delegate). Could it be that this format is the ordinary appointment of a titular bishop? Certainly there is nothing in either *Motu Proprio* that grants power to consecrate without a papal mandate. This carefully guarded prerogative of the Holy See is of such importance that it cannot be included without specification in a general delegation of powers, even so-called plenipotentary powers [which belong to the Holy See—not to the delegate]. Such powers are either specified or non-existent, because no one is required to believe them without specific authority. The

obligation to believe is just the opposite. We must not believe without the specified authority.

Our alternative is anarchy—which, of course, we obviously have. If we can have false Christs why can we not have false representatives of Christ?

If anyone takes it upon himself to consecrate bishops for the Catholic Church he must maintain control of these bishops. If he assumes papal prerogatives he must assume papal responsibility. He cannot shrug off the results. If he cannot control such bishops he dare not consecrate them. This respect for the pope's authority is built into the sacramental rite. Whoever assumes control necessarily assumes responsibility. Failure to recognize this could be characterized a form of insanity. Even if not, the results are the same anarchy.

When a man turns loose a horde of heretics, we need not assume his pure motives or his proper judgment. We need not assume that he did this for the Church, or had the Church's approval for his irresponsible acts. We may not assume that all these wildcats have a mission from the Church.

You write that you are interested only in facts, and list eleven of this elusive species to Gary

Giuffre.

Fact 3. He was raised to the patriarchate privately by Pope Pius XI in 1938. (Proof?)

Fact 4. In his person, he was granted plenipotentiary powers ... (Proof? Field? In your two certificates of appointment to Thuc and d'Herbigny the only mention of power is that of the Holy Apostolic See by which these two were appointed legate and delegate respectively. Nor has either by these documents been appointed patriarch. Nor has Vietnam ever been established as a patriarchate.)

Fact 5. Neither the patriarchate nor the plenipotentiary powers were ever withdrawn by Pius XII. (First prove that such powers existed. No one withdraws what has not been conferred.)

Fact 6. Archbishop Ngo Dinh Thuc never defected from the faith. (Nor did any other bishop at Vatican II or afterwards, by acceptance of the new "Church?")

Facts 7, 9, and 10 are that you have never seen certain items.

Fact 11. ... access to a document signed by him (Thuc) in which he declared that following Clemente's blinding, any consecrations and ordinations that Clemente would perform ... would be sacramentally invalid. (He evidently forgot that Clemente was a seer, and did not need the physical use of his eyes. If Clemente had truly been consecrated bishop, and his earlier "consecrations" were valid, what invalidated the subsequent "consecrations?")

Clemente's purpose in receiving consecration has subsequently been shown to be the setting up of the Holy Palmarian Church. Was that the Church's intention? A priest intending to be consecrated bishop must have the Church's intention. You don't suppose that Clemente was in it for prestige, or even money? He may even have been set up by the Roman Congregation for Incredibility. No, I could not resist "acidulous comment."

ATTENTION: FATHER ROBERT CROOKER

Document concerning Peter Martin Ngo Dinh Thuc, submitted for appraisal and comment. [So far, no reply.]

Page 1 is a photocopy of a document signed by Pope Pius XI: *Plenitudine potestatis Sanctae Sedis Apostolicae deputamus in Nostrum Legatum Petrum Martinum Ngo Dinh Thuc Episcopum titularem Saesinensis ad fines Nobis notos, cum omnibus necessariis facultatibus.*

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die xv mensis Martii MCMXXXVIII Pontificatus Nostri anno septimo decimo. (By the fullness of the power of the Holy Apostolic See we depute as Our Legate Peter Martin Ngo Dinh Thuc titular Bishop of Saigon for the territory known to us, with all necessary faculties. Given at Rome at St. Peter, 15th day of March 1938 in the 17th year of Our Pontificate.)

Page 2 displays this document beside a similar document signed by the same pope: *Plenitudine potestatis Apostolicae deputamus in Nostrum Delegatum Michaellem d'Herbigny, S.J. Episcopum titularem Ilionensis ad fines Nobis notos, cum omnibus opportunis et necessariis facultatibus.*

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die x mensis Martii MCMXXVI Pontificatus Nostri anno quinto. (By the fullness of Apostolic power we depute as Our Delegate Michel d'Herbigny titular Bishop of Troy for **the territory** known to us, with all opportune and necessary faculties.

Given at Rome at St. Peter, 10th day of March 1926 in the 5th year of Our Pontificate.)

This latter document is designated *Motu Proprio*, and takes a little trouble to decipher. Twelve years later a secretary could write legibly.

The Powers of Monseigneur Ngo Dinh Thuc (translation pp. 10-11, *Sous la Banniere*):

"On 15 March 1938, Pope Pius XI honoured Monseigneur Pierre Martin Ngo Dinh Thuc with a most extraordinary confidence by delegating to him powers of which we reproduce ...

photocopy:

Pius XI, Pope

By virtue of the plenitude of the powers of the Holy Apostolic See, we appoint as our Legate Pierre Martin Ngo Dinh Thuc, titular bishop of Saigon, whom we invest with all the necessary

powers, **for purposes** known to us.

Done in Rome at St. Peter, on 15 March 1938, the seventeenth year of our pontificate.

Pius XI, Pope

“On 10 March 1926, the same pope Pius XI dictated the same *motu proprio* to the benefit of Monseigneur d’Herbigny (S.J.). The photocopy of the letter has been taken from the book of Father Paul Lesourd, published by the Lethielleux Editions under the title “*Le Jesuite clandestin*”:

Motu Proprio

Pius XI, Pope

By virtue of the plenitude of the Apostolic power, we appoint as our Delegate Michel d’Herbigny (S.J.), titular bishop of Troie, whom we invest with all the appropriate and necessary powers, **for purposes** known to us.

Done in Rome at St. Peter, on 10 March 1926, the fifth year of our pontificate.

Pius XI, Pope

“**The two cases are analogous.** [A prodigious leap to an unwarranted conclusion!] With this Act of the Holy See [*Two acts* — twelve years apart!] the two bishops received **pontifical powers**, those of **Patriarchs**. The details of these powers are explained by Pius XI himself, as reported by Father Lesourd ... :

“Orally, the Holy Father first enumerated in detail all the powers which he conferred, including the selection of priests to be ordained and to confer to them the episcopate without the need for them to have pontifical bulls, nor therefore to give their signatures inviting them to act accordingly on the strength of the oath.

“Then, after having at length set out in detail by word of mouth all the powers which were really extraordinary, the Pope resumed them most solemnly as follows: ‘In one word, we grant to you all the pontifical powers of the Pope himself, which are not of incommunicable divine right.’ ”

Monseigneur Ngo Dinh Thuc was therefore(!) in possession of the same powers. [Again a step is missing. The only thing common to these two men is that they were appointed titular bishops and were delegated authority. Nowhere is it stated that they were delegated for the same purposes, even if that translation can be upheld. There is no ground for such an assumption.] They have never been withdrawn, as far as we know. [In signing certain documents of the Second Vatican Council, Ngo Dinh Thuc—like Marcel Lefebvre—lost all offices in the Catholic Church under provisions of Canons 188 and 2314 of the 1917-18 Code of Canon Law.] ...

In any case, we now have the proof that he was holding from an authentic pope the plenary powers of a Patriarch. [Why did he not know this, and use it as justification for his irrational behavior at Palmar de Troya?] ... this provides an important element concerning the validity (lawfulness) [Another mistake! Validity and lawfulness are not equivalent.] of the ordinations which he has conferred. This material proof(!) is an important asset of the file. [If this is significant to anyone, he would make far better use of his time catching butterflies.]

The above submission to Father Crooker in Houston is quoted from Thuc’s “defender” and his submissions in support of his preposterous claim that these two certificates of appointment as titular bishops-legates are analogous, and that therefore Ngo Dinh Thuc was invested with the same powers granted d’Herbigny. There was nothing analogous about their situations.

D’Herbigny, in 1926, was slated for Soviet Russia, where he would be utterly on his own, and any contact with Rome would have been attempted at the greatest risk to his life. Ngo Dinh Thuc, twelve years later, was delegated to French Indo-China, where he was a member of a powerful Catholic family which eventually took over the government of the country when the French left. But such facts are glossed over by a “defender” who repairs for Mass(?) and sacraments(?) to Terence Dowling, a priest(?) and bishop(?) through the hapless mediums of Ngo Dinh Thuc, Clemente Dominguez Gomez, and Raymond Maurice Terrason.

The “defender” refuses to drop the subject. He has broadened his accusations to include heresy, and threatens to circulate my mailing list with the specification. I cannot recall having furnished him (or anyone else) such a list. So to save him the trouble and expense I herewith publish his complaint, included in my reply of September 29, 2003:

... No need exists to make sport of you. All needed to flatten you is verbatim quotation of your recent letters. You accuse me of heresy for stating a truism: Everyone is superior to his own words; they could not exist without him. This is so obvious that I almost felt foolish in calling it to your attention. Every miracle, for instance, is an exception from normalcy. The first and most certain canonization (Dismas, the crucified robber) demonstrated Christ's superiority over His own words: "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost ..." It is almost embarrassing to try to address such a non-issue. You must be hard up for legitimate arguments.

Thuc went to Palmar de Troya and ordained and consecrated known heretics with whom he was unacquainted. Everyone is entitled to conclude that he therein acted irresponsibly and irrationally, and to question his every action thereafter.

Canon 2261 applies to clerics who have or had genuine Orders **in the Catholic Church**. We can't approach Thuc, Lefebvre, or Lienart for sacraments; they're dead. We have every right to avoid all whom they have ordained(?) or consecrated(?) because these are outside the Catholic Church in their almost impossible Orders and were never Catholic priests (or bishops) with status in the Church. We may not repair to them, even for the last rites. Canon 2261 does not concern them.

Neither Trent nor Leo XIII adverted to such a situation as Lienart's and Lefebvre's. "The Church does not pass judgment ..." Nor can it guarantee intentions of high-degree, devil-worshipping, masonic apostates. My "new" question is elicited by a seldom precedented problem. (The Church defines doctrines when these are questioned or controverted.) I am not bound to believe in Lienart's intention to comply with the Church's intention for the Church's purpose. The Church certainly has never intended to ordain or consecrate apostates.

So your "Court of Conscience" is the exclusive province of the Holy Ghost? May I not reason—in your fashion—that you here deny the dogma of the Holy Trinity?

So I invent moral theology? In matters of serious and extreme doubt, am I not obliged to the safe course? You quote St. Augustine to the effect that "neither personal faith nor moral goodness is an absolute requirement in the ministers of the sacraments." And Leeming, in the only reference you could dig up, writes: "Since the first century ... provided due matter, form, and **intention** are present ..." **Intention** is the precise bone of contention. I see no reason to believe in the proper intention of an apostate either to receive or confer the sacrament of Holy Orders. I have at least as much right and reason to disbelieve as you have to believe—and *I have no axe to grind*. My question is not unlawful. Nor may it be dodged because new. Why would it be asked before the occasion arose? Why am I not entitled to an answer? Especially if, as you seem to think, it concerns my salvation?

Father Barbara had his moments. He swallowed Guerard des Laurieres' **material but not formal pope**. You say he corrected his views on Thuc and Lefebvre. I say he was correct before he "corrected" these views. I am responsible for none of his views.

And who sent you? And why, in these convoluted times in which nearly all clerics have gone wrong, do you try to bind me to the opinion of one cleric and the foolish actions of another? (end of reply)

D'Fender then accused me of mistranslating his feeble proofs. This man, evidently insufficiently acquainted with Latin grammar and usage, charges me with an error which no Latin student would make. It appears that the phrase *ad fines* (which appears in both certificates of appointment) means (as he has so "correctly" translated in his version) for purposes (known to us). Obviously, he writes, since my word "territory" is in the singular, the Latin would also have been in the singular, to wit, *ad finem*. We have here a man willing to pontificate on Latin usage

in which he has shown himself in error. We need not wonder that he pontificates on canon laws and ecclesiastical powers concerning which he is also in error.

Latin Grammar, Lawrence Englmann, revised by Michael Hlavcak, O.S.B., M.A., 16th edition, 1940, p. 21, §42, Nouns with a plural of different signification

| Singular | Plural |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| auxilium, <i>help</i> | auxilia, <i>auxiliary troops</i> |
| castrum, <i>fort</i> | castra, <i>camp</i> |
| copia, <i>abundance</i> | copiae, <i>troops</i> |
| facultas, <i>ability</i> | facultates, <i>property</i> |
| gratia, <i>favor</i> | gratiae, <i>thanks</i> |
| finis, <i>end, border</i> | fines, <i>borders, territory</i> |
| impedimentum, <i>obstacle</i> | impedimenta, <i>baggage</i> * |
| littera, <i>letter (alphabet)</i> | litterae, <i>epistle, literature</i> * |
| (ops) opem, <i>assistance</i> | opes, <i>power, wealth</i> |
| pars, <i>part</i> | partes, <i>parts, party, faction</i> |
| sal, <i>salt</i> | sales, <i>witticism, wit.</i> |

*also regular plural

Lewis & Short, A Latin Dictionary, page 752: *finis*—in plural, borders, and hence territory, land, country enclosed within boundaries.

Lexicon of the Latin Language, F. P. Leverett, page 338—country itself, a territory.

Not content with detroying me doctrinally, canonically, grammatically, and linguistically, this d’Fender has blasted me ethnically. He classes me with that perfidious DeValera, who, he says, deliberately left the lights on in Dublin to guide the *Luftwaffe* in its nocturnal bombing of London.

* * * * *

The War Is Now! # 61 May 2004

The New American Bible (Copyright 1991) has been imposed on Catholics by the American bishops to replace the Rheims-Douai, Rheims-Douai-Challoner, Haydock, Confraternity, and Ronald Knox translations. It is new, updated for us Anglophones no longer acquainted with usage and vocabulary. The last Book in the Old Testament, Second Maccabees has been upgraded to the end of the historical books. We sample our new Writ and compare it with an older version.

Douai 12:40. And they found under the coats of the slain, some of the donaries of the idols of Jamnia, which the law forbiddeth to the Jews: so that all plainly saw, that for this cause they were slain. (Comment: Of the donaries, etc... That is, of the votive offerings, which had been hung up in the temples of the idols, which they had taken away when they burnt the port of Jamnia, ver. 9., contrary to the prohibition of the law, Deut. 7.25.)

New American Bible xii, 40. But under the tunic of each of the dead they found amulets sacred to the idols of Jamnia, which the law forbids the Jews to wear. So it was clear to all that this was why these men had been slain. (No comment)

Douai 12:41. Then they all blessed the just judgment of the Lord, who had discovered the things that were hidden.

New American Bible 12:41. They all therefore praised the ways of the Lord, the just judge who brings to light the things that are hidden.

Douai 12:42. And so betaking themselves to prayers, they besought him, that the sin which had been committed might be forgotten. But the most valiant Judas exhorted the people to keep themselves from sin, forasmuch as they saw before their eyes what had happened, because of the sins of those that were slain.

New American Bible 12:42. Turning to supplication, they prayed that the sinful deed might be

fully blotted out. The noble Judas warned the soldiers to keep themselves free from sin, for they had seen with their own eyes what had happened because of the sin of those who had fallen.

Douai 12:43. And making a gathering, he sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection.

New American Bible 12: 43. He then took up a collection among all his soldiers, amounting to two thousand silver drachmas, which he sent to Jerusalem to provide for an expiatory sacrifice. In doing this he acted in a very excellent and noble way, inasmuch as he had the resurrection of the dead in view:

Douai 12:44. (For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should rise again, it would have seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead,)

New American Bible 12:44. for if he were not expecting the fallen to rise again, it would have been useless and foolish to pray for them in death.

Douai 12:45. And because he considered that they who had fallen asleep with godliness, had great grace laid up for them. (Comment: With godliness... Judas hoped that these men who died fighting for the cause of God and religion, might find mercy: either because they might be excused from mortal sin by ignorance; or might have repented of their sin, at least at their death.)

New American Bible 12: 45. But if he did this with a view to the splendid reward that awaits those who had gone to rest in godliness, it was a holy and pious thought. (No comment)

Douai 12:46. It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins. (Comment: It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead... Here is an evident and undeniable proof of the practice of praying for the dead under the old law, which was then strictly observed by the Jews, and consequently could not be introduced at that time by Judas, their chief and high priest, if it had not been always their custom.)

[This passage has ever been cited by the Catholic Church as Scriptural proof of Purgatory. Why the weaseling comment in the New American Bible? So that we in pursuit of ecumenism may not needlessly repel non-Catholics. Most Protestants exclude the Books of the Maccabees from the Canon of Scripture, because the Jews exclude them. Though these books would make every Jewish heart swell with pride, they are excluded because written not in Hebrew but in Greek—as though God could not inspire Greek text. So why do Protestants include the New Testament?]

New American Bible 12;46. Thus he made atonement for the dead that they might be freed from this sin. -- Note 12, 42-46. This is the earliest statement of the doctrine that prayers (v 42) for the dead are efficacious. The statement is made here, however, only for the purpose of proving that Judas believed in the resurrection of the just (7,9. 14. 23. 36). That is, he believed that expiation could be made for certain sins of otherwise good men—soldiers who had given their lives for God’s cause. Thus, they could share in the resurrection. His belief was similar to, but not quite the same as, the Catholic doctrine of purgatory. [Judas believed? Had not his whole army shared his belief, he would not have collected a plugged obol. This money was doubtless loot from Jamnia. The soldiers would hardly have left home carrying such a huge amount.]

* * * * *

Do American bishops believe in Purgatory? Are we one with them in faith?

VATICAN CITY – Garrulous Karolus, the Koran-Kisser rang in the New Year ... *with a renewed call for peace in the Middle East and Africa and the creation of a new world order based on respect for the dignity of man and equality among nations.* [Equality among nations is achieved only at the expense of superior nations.] [He] presided over a morning Mass inside St. Peter’s Basilica to mark the World Day of Peace, which the Roman Catholic Church celebrates every Jan. 1. [Can we not find something real to celebrate?]

John Paul directed his thoughts to continuing conflicts around the globe. But he stressed that to bring about peace, there needs to be a new respect for international law and the creation of a

“new international order” based on the goals of the United Nations. He called for “an order that is able to give adequate solutions to today’s problems based on the dignity of the human being, on an integral development of society, on solidarity among nations rich and poor, on the sharing of resources and the extraordinary results of scientific and technical progress.”

[One would almost expect some lip-service to adherence to morality and justice. The source, for too many, assumes the inference of infallibility. This appears rather to be a logical consequence of another “papal” panegyric of Marxist (and Masonic) principles]:

Paul VI’s Address, United Nations, October, 1965

The peoples of the Earth turn to the United Nations as the last hope of concord and peace. We presume to present here, with their tribute of honour and of hope, Our own tribute also. You give sanction to the great principle that the relations between peoples should be regulated by reason, by justice, by law, by negotiation—not by force, not by violence, not by war, not by fear or deceit. **Thus it must be.**

Allow us to congratulate you for having had the wisdom to open this hall to the younger peoples, to those States which have recently attained independence and national freedom. Their presence is the proof of the universality and magnanimity which inspire the principles of this institution. **Thus it must be.** This is Our praise and Our good wish and, as you can see [from that twice interpolated phrase?], We do not attribute these as from outside. We derive them from inside, from the very genius of your institution.

[This is probably a translation—into Australian. That emphasized phrase, which has nothing to do with context, would in these United States be rendered **So must it be**, which translates into freemasonic ritual: **So mote it be**, used repetitiously after each Masonic dogma or prayer, as we would use **Amen**.]

[“We do not attribute these as from outside. We derive them from inside, from the very genius of your institution.” This seems to have indicated that the Vatican is a member of the UN and/or “We are inside the Freemasons.” He thereby conveyed his message to his lodge brethren in such a way that he would not be automatically excommunicated. He could not afford to have his Council rejected, or to have too much attention called at that stage to its heretical documents. We had not yet been renewed.] Is there anyone who does not see the necessity of coming thus progressively to the establishment of a world authority, able to act efficaciously on the juridical and political levels?

We rejoice in the knowledge that many of you have considered favourably Our invitation, addressed to all States in the cause of peace from Bombay last December, to divert to the benefit of the developing countries at least a part of the savings which could be realized by reducing armaments. We here renew that invitation, trusting in your sentiments of humanity and generosity.

In so doing, We become aware that We are echoing another principle which is structural to the United Nations, which is its positive and affirmative high point—namely, that you work here not only to avert conflicts between States, but also to make them capable of **working the ones for the others**.

You are not satisfied with facilitating mere coexistence between nations. You take a much greater step forward, one deserving of Our praise and support—you organize the brotherly collaboration of peoples. In this way a system of solidarity is set up, and its lofty civilized aims win the orderly and unanimous support of all the family of peoples for the common good and for the good of each individual. This aspect of the organization of the United Nations is the most beautiful. It is its most truly human visage. It is the ideal of which mankind dreams on its pilgrimage through time. It is the world’s greatest hope. [This from a man supposedly heading

the religion which has always taught that **the Catholic Church** is the world's only hope.] Statements like the above, even had they emanated from real popes, cannot be invested with papal infallibility because they fall outside the scope of that privilege. They are neither faith nor morals. They have nothing to do with the Deposit of Faith—to which papal infallibility is absolutely confined.

At Vatican II ... when it seemed that the conservatives could rally enough opposition to have a statement on religious liberty dropped, Wojtyla ... took the lead in insisting that a firm statement would greatly aid in struggles with communist regimes. ... he opposed demands ... for a strong condemnation of atheism [it would be at best counter-productive]. Speaking on the church in today's world ... he said: "It is not the church's place to teach unbelievers. She must seek in common with the world. ... Let us avoid any spirit of monopolizing and moralizing. One of the major faults of this schema is that the church appears authoritarian ..." – *The Inner Elite*, Dossiers of Papal Candidates, Gary MacEoin & Committee for the Responsible Election of the Pope, 1978, Sheed Andrews & McMeel, Inc.

* * * * *

Humani Generis Redemptionem (On Preaching the Word of God)
Encyclical of Pope Benedict XV June 15, 1917.

It was the desire of Jesus Christ once He had wrought the Redemption of the human race by His death on the altar of the Cross, to lead men to obey His commands and thus win eternal life. To attain this end He used no other means than the voice of His heralds whose work it was to announce to all mankind what they had to believe and do in order to be saved. "It pleased God, by the foolishness of our preaching, to save them that believed." [Cor. i:21] He chose therefore His Apostles, and after infusing into their minds by the power of the Holy Ghost, the gifts in harmony with their high calling, "Go ye into the world," He told them, "and preach the Gospel." [Mark xvi, 15.] Their preaching renewed the face of the earth. For if the religion of Christ has withdrawn the minds of men from errors of every kind to the truth, and won their hearts from the degradation of vice to the excellence and beauty of every virtue, assuredly it has done so by means of that very preaching. "Faith then cometh by hearing; and hearing by the word of Christ." [Rom. x:17]

Wherefore since by God's good pleasure, things are preserved through the same causes by which they were brought into being, it is evident that the preaching of the wisdom taught us by the Christian religion is the means Divinely employed to continue the work of eternal salvation, and that it must with just reason be looked upon as a matter of the greatest and most momentous concern. ...

5. For the duty of preaching, as the Council of Trent teaches, "is the paramount duty of Bishops." [Sess., xxiv, De. Ref., c.iv] And the Apostles, whose successors the bishops are, looked upon it as something peculiarly theirs. St. Paul writes: "For Christ sent us not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel." [I Cor. i:17] And the other Apostles were of the opinion that: "It is not reason that we should leave the Word of God and serve tables." [Acts vi:2] But although preaching is properly the duty of Bishops, nevertheless, since it is impossible that they should always or everywhere be able to discharge it in person, distracted as they are by the many cares which they meet in the government of their churches, they must of necessity comply with this obligation through others. Wherefore it cannot be doubted that all those who in addition to the Bishops are thus engaged, are employed in the performance of an episcopal duty. Let this then be the first law laid down: that no one on his own responsibility undertake the office of preaching. In order to fulfill that duty everyone must have a lawful mission, and that mission can be conferred by the Bishop alone. "How shall they preach, unless they be sent?" [Rom. x:15] Now the Apostles were sent and sent by Him who is the supreme pastor and Bishop of our souls [I Pet. ii:25]; so too, were the seventy-two first disciples; nay, St. Paul himself, although constituted by Christ a vessel

of election to carry His name, before Gentiles and kings, [Acts ix:15] entered upon his apostolate only after the elders in obedience to the command of the Holy Ghost, "Separate me Saul for the work" [Acts xiii:2], had imposed hands upon him and sent him forth. The same practice was constantly followed in the early days of the Church. For all without exception, both those who distinguished themselves in the priestly order like Origen, and those later on were raised to the dignity of the episcopate, like Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Augustine and the other more ancient Doctors of the Church, undertook the office of preaching with the sanction and authority of their Bishops.

6. ... Here therefore we would have you pay the greatest heed to whom you commit so sacred a duty. By the decree of the Council of Trent Bishops are permitted to select for this office those only who are "fit," i.e. those who "can exercise the ministry of preaching with profit to souls."

7. "With profit to souls," well note that the word which expresses the rule does not mean eloquently or with popular applause, but with spiritual fruit. This is the end for which the ministry of the Divine Word is instituted. If now you would have Us define more exactly the qualifications of those who are really to be considered fit, We answer: those in whom you find the signs of a Divine vocation. Whatever is required for admission to the priesthood, is likewise needed if one is to be considered eligible and fit for the office of preaching. "Neither doth any man take this honor to himself, but he that is called by God." [Heb. v:4] Such a vocation is easily determined. For Christ Our Lord and Master, when about to ascend into heaven, did not by any means bid His Apostles forthwith go into diverse places and begin their preaching: "But stay you in the city," He said, "till you be indued with power from on high." [Luke xxiv:49] This, therefore, is the sign by which you may know whether any one is Divinely called to this task: if he "is indued" with power from on high. What this means, Venerable Brethren, may be gathered from what took place in the case of the Apostles as soon as they had received power from on high. For when the Holy Spirit had descended upon them, not to mention here the wonderful gifts with which they were endowed, they were transformed from frail unlettered disciples into learned and perfect men. If a priest therefore has the required knowledge and virtue together with those natural qualifications necessary, without which he would be tempting God, he may be considered as having a true vocation for the office of preaching and there is no reason why he may not be admitted by the Bishop to this ministry. Such is the meaning of the Council of Trent when it decrees that the Bishop is not to permit any to preach unless they are "of approved virtue and learning." (Loc cit.) Wherefore it is the duty of the Bishop long and thoroughly to examine those who are to be entrusted by him with the function of preaching that he may find out the nature and extent of their learning. If any one acts carelessly and negligently in this duty, he clearly offends in a grievous matter, and on him will fall the responsibility of the errors which the untrained preacher may spread or of the scandal and the bad example which the unworthy one may give.

11. Not all however who depart from the right rule and norm, Venerable Brethren, are seeking for nothing but popular applause in their preaching. Frequently the preachers who avail themselves of these devices do so to attain some other and even less honorable object. Forgetting the saying of Gregory: "The priest does not preach that he may eat, but should eat that he may preach," [In I Regum, lib. iii], there are not a few who, because they think that they are unsuited for other labors by which they might be decently supported, take to preaching, not that they may worthily exercise the sacred ministry, but to make money. We therefore see them devoting all their attention not indeed to finding where greater fruit for souls may be hoped for, but where preaching reaps a more lucrative return.

12. Now since nothing except harm and discredit can be expected for the Church from such as these, Venerable Brethren, you must exercise the greatest care, so that, if you detect any one for

his own glory or for gain, abusing the office of preaching, you should at once remove him from that function. For the man who does not scruple to defile so holy an office by such an unworthy perversion of its end, surely will not hesitate to descend to any indignity, and will bring the stain of ignominy not merely upon himself, but upon the sacred office also which he so unworthily administers.

13. The same severity is to be shown towards those who fail to preach properly because they have neglected the acquisition of whatever is necessary for performing this function becomingly. What these conditions are We may learn from the example of him whom the Church has called “the Preacher of truth,” the Apostle St. Paul. Would that by God’s mercy We might have many more preachers like him!

14. The first lesson, therefore, that We learn from St. Paul is how well prepared and equipped he was for preaching. But We do not refer now to the learned studies he had assiduously pursued under Gamaliel. For the knowledge poured into his soul by revelation dimmed and nearly eclipsed the knowledge he had acquired by his own efforts, though that the latter knowledge was of no little value to him is clear from his Epistles. Learning, as We have said, is absolutely necessary for the preacher, for if he is without the light of learning he easily falls into error, since “Ignorance is the mother of all errors,” as the Fourth Lateran Council so truthfully observes. We would not be understood, however, to mean every sort of knowledge, but only that which it becomes a priest to possess, that is to say, the knowledge, to phrase it briefly, which consists of a knowledge of self, of God and his duties. For self-knowledge, We maintain, will lead a priest to renounce his own advantage. The knowledge of God will lead him to make everyone else know and love God, and the knowledge of his office will lead him to discharge his own duties and to teach others to do theirs. If he lacks these three kinds of knowledge, whatever other learning he has, will only puff him up, and will be useless.

15. Let us now consider what the Apostle’s spiritual preparation for preaching was. The three qualities of his equipment most worthy of note are these: First of all he was a man who always fully conformed himself to God’s will. No sooner was he smitten, when on the road to Damascus, by the power of the Lord Jesus than he uttered that cry so worthy of an apostle: “Lord what will thou have me to do?” [Acts ix:6] For then and there as ever afterwards, for Christ’s sake he was indifferent to toil or rest, to poverty or wealth, to praise or contempt, to life or death. There can be no doubt that he made such progress in the apostolate because he conformed with such perfect submission to the will of God.

Wherefore like St. Paul, every preacher devoted to the salvation of souls should be first of all so zealous for God’s service as to feel no concern about who his hearers are to be, what success he will have, or what fruits he is to reap. He should have an eye not to his own advantage but to God’s glory.

19. However, to return to St. Paul, if we ask on what subjects he was wont to discourse when he preached, he condenses them all in these words: “For I judged not myself to know anything among you but Jesus Christ and Him crucified.” [I Cor. ii:2] To make men know Jesus Christ better and better, and to make that knowledge have a bearing, moreover, not only on their faith, but on their lives as well, was the object of that apostolic man’s every endeavor. This was the object of every throb of his apostolic heart. Therefore all Christ’s doctrines and commands, even the sterner ones, were so proclaimed by St. Paul that he did not restrict, gloss over or tone down what Christ taught regarding humility, self-denial, chastity, contempt of the world, obedience, forgiveness of enemies, and the like, nor was he afraid to tell his hearers that they had to make a choice between the service of God and the service of Belial, for they could not serve both, that

when they leave this world, a dread judgment awaits them; that they cannot bargain with God; they may hope for life everlasting if they keep His entire law, but if they neglect their duty and indulge their passions, they will have nothing to expect but eternal fire. For our “Preacher of truth” never imagined that he should avoid such subjects, because, owing to the corruption of the age, they appeared too stern to his hearers. Therefore it is clear how unworthy of commendation are those preachers who are afraid to touch upon certain points of Christian doctrine lest they should give their hearers offense. Does a physician prescribe useless remedies to his patient, merely because the sick man rejects effective ones? The test of the orator’s power and skill is his success in making his hearers accept the stern truth he is preaching. How did the Apostle unfold the subjects of which he treated? “Not in the persuasive words of human wisdom.” [I Cor. ii:4] It is perfectly plain, Venerable Brethren, how important for everybody it is that they should thoroughly realize this, since we see that not a few of our sacred preachers overlook in their sermons the Sacred Scriptures, the Fathers and Doctors of the Church,” and the arguments based on sacred theology, and for the most part, make their appeals only to reason. Unquestionably that is wrong, for in the supernatural order, merely human resources are of no help whatever. But the objection may be urged: The people have no confidence in the preacher who insists on Divinely revealed truths. Is that true? With non-Catholics, granted. However, when the Greeks sought the Wisdom, forsooth, of this world, the Apostle, nevertheless, preached to them Christ crucified. If we direct our attention, however, to Catholic people, even those men among them who are unfriendly to us, generally keep in their hearts the roots of faith. Their intellects are blinded because their souls are corrupted. Lastly, what end did St. Paul have in his preaching? Not to please men, but Christ. “If I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.” [Gal. i: 10] As his heart was on fire with the love of Christ, he sought for nothing save the glory of Christ. O that all are engaged in the ministry of the Word were true lovers of Jesus Christ. Would that all could repeat these words of St. Paul: “For whom [Jesus Christ] I have suffered the loss of all things,” [Phil. iii:8] and “To me to live is Christ.” [Phil.i:21] Only those who glow with love themselves know how to set on fire the hearts of others. Wherefore St. Bernard gave a preacher this counsel: “If you are wise, be a reservoir, not a conduit, be full yourself of what you preach and do not think it enough to pour it out for others.” [In Cant. Serm. 18] The Doctor then adds: “Today we have in the Church a profusion of conduits, but how few are the reservoirs!”

20. We must strive with all our might and main, Venerable Brethren, to prevent such a state of things from occurring in the future. For it is your duty, by rejecting the unfit and by encouraging, training and guiding the fit, to bring it to pass that there should now be no lack of preachers who are men after God’s own heart.

Given at St. Peter’s, Rome, on the fifteenth day of June, on the Feast of the Sacred Heart of Jesus in the year nineteen hundred and seventeen, in the third of Our Pontificate.

* * * * *

The Catholic Encyclopedia (1913) Vol. X, p.23. **Mass**

For whom may Mass be celebrated? In general the answer may be given: For all those and for those only, who are fitted to participate in the fruits of the Mass as an impetratory, propitiatory, and satisfactory sacrifice. From this is immediately derived the rule that Mass may not be said for the damned in Hell or the blessed in Heaven, since they are incapable of receiving the fruits of the Mass; for the same reason children who die unbaptized are excluded from the benefits of the Mass. Thus, there remain as the possible participants only the living on earth and the poor souls in purgatory (cf. Trent, Sess. XXII, can. Iii; Sess XXV, decret. De purgat.). Partly out of veneration for the Sacrifice, however, and partly to avoid scandal, the Church has surrounded with certain conditions, which priests are bound in obedience to observe, the application of Mass for certain classes of the living and dead. The first class are non-tolerated excommunicated persons, who are to be avoided by the faithful (excommunicati vitandi). Although, according to

various authors, the priest is not forbidden to offer up Mass for such unhappy persons in private and with a merely mental intention, still to announce publicly such a Mass or to insert the name of the excommunicated person in the prayers, even though he may be in the state of grace owing to perfect sorrow or may have died truly repentant, would be a “communicatio in divinis”, and is strictly forbidden under penalty of excommunication (cf. C. 28, de sent. Excomm., V, t. 39). It is likewise forbidden to offer the Mass and solemnly for deceased non-Catholics, even though they were princes (Innoc. III, C. 12, 1, 3, tit. 28). On the other hand it is allowed, in consideration of the welfare of the state, to celebrate for a non-Catholic living ruler even a public Solemn Mass. For living heretics and schismatics, also for the Jews, Turks, and heathens, Mass may be privately applied (and even a stipend taken) with the object of procuring for them the grace of conversion to the true Faith. For a deceased heretic the private and hypothetical application of the Mass is allowed only when the priest has good grounds for believing that the deceased held his error in good

faith (*bona fide*. Cf. S. C. Officii, 7 April, 1875). To celebrate Mass privately for deceased catechumens is permissible, since we may assume that they are already justified by their desire of Baptism and are in purgatory. In like manner Mass may be celebrated privately for the souls of deceased Jews and heathens, who have led an upright life, since the sacrifice is intended to benefit all who are in purgatory. — Joseph Pohle, S.T.D., Ph.D., J.C.L., Professor of Dogmatic Theology, University of Breslau

* * * * *

On page 48 of *Is The Pope Catholic?* I quoted (line 26) from *Quo primum tempore*, St Pius V's Bull imposing the oldest rite of Mass in existence on the Latin Church. I had seen no reason to check the translation; I had used the version contained in Father James Wathen's *The Great Sacrilege*—and he was on our side. So we both included eight words—"This new rite alone is to be used"—which appear nowhere in the original Latin text. So in the following paragraph, the Bull does not refer to "this new rite." We can well omit the entire sentence. It may behove me to reprint the book!

This error was called to my attention by Dr. Leonard Giblin, occasional contributor to this periodical. He emphasized that "this new rite" contradicts St. Pius V's declared purpose of restoring "the Missal itself to the original form and rite of the holy Fathers," as stated in paragraph 2 of the same translation. "The 'change agents' and their 'useful idiots,' working so diligently to destroy the Church from within, often use the fraudulent 'this new rite' ... as evidence that Pope St. Pius V created a new rite with the Tridentine Missal—trying to deflect the same charge from the *novus ordo missae*."

"But those of us with a modicum of experience in defending our faith and Holy Mother Church against the New Order's deceits should know better than to trust their translators. Any who read *Quo primum* in Latin as printed since 1570, or a faithful translation, will see that 'new rite' (*novus ritus*) cannot be found in that document. Nor any words that even the most demented mind can torture into 'this new rite.' "

Quo primum in other languages abounds on the net. Leonard checked French, Spanish, and Italian, finding never a suggestion of "this new rite." But I found this same error on Vatican and Episcopal Documents 2.0 from Catholic Software, P.O. Box 1914, Murray, KY 42071.

* * * * *

Nine Eleven, the date the twin towers of the World Trade Center not only bit the dust but crumbled into it, has achieved a like, but far more significant, disaster in the *Houston Chronicle's* report on pulverization of the moral code by Cardinal Ratzinger, whose duty it is to preserve it.

The article reprinted from the *Washington Post* reads: "Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, the Vatican's arbiter of doctrinal orthodoxy, has given Catholic voters leeway under certain circumstances to vote for politicians who support abortion rights, U.S. Catholic officials said Tuesday.

"... Archbishop Raymond Burke of St. Louis last week clarified remarks he made ... he said a Catholic who votes for a politician supporting abortion rights is committing a grave sin ... "Burke now says that, in theory, there could be 'proportionate reasons' that justify voting for someone who does not share the church's position against abortion — though in practice, ... 'it is difficult to imagine' what such reasons would be."

Ratzinger is quoted: "A Catholic would be guilty of formal co-operation in evil, and so unworthy to present himself for Holy Communion, if he were to deliberately vote for a candidate precisely because of the candidate's permissive stand on abortion and/or euthanasia. When a Catholic does not share a candidate's stand in favor of abortion and/or euthanasia, but votes for that candidate for other reasons, it is considered remote material cooperation, which can be permitted in the presence of proportionate reasons."

This is like taking a contraceptive pill for acne. No Catholic can in conscience vote for or in any way support a candidate who supports abortion. Nor can he vote for or support a candidate who

supports an unjust war. If everyone who will not condone murder would vote for Peroutka (Constitution Party) we could achieve a moral government. It might be the first since the Confederacy.

Bush supports abortion as much as Kerry, and far more effectively. He rode into office on that Florida election fraud and on his stance “against abortion.” He has had nearly four years to obliterate it. “Give me a bill,” he says, “I’ll sign it.” Presidents have been known to introduce bills and have them passed—like the Patriot Act, a reaction to a few thousand deaths at the World Trade Center—a drop in the hogshead compared with the abortion carnage.

Return of the “Scholars”

That’s right—the same critics of a stolen working script of **The Passion of the Christ** who without precedent damned a motion picture before they (or anyone) had seen it. They worked their typing fingers to the bone to prevent its release. In the process they tried to destroy not only everyone connected with the production but all their relatives as well. They lost the battle of the box-office, but they now return in force, in a book printed by Disney, a business which deals in cartoons and fairy tales.

What brings them back? Can they unshow the picture? Do they seriously believe that the same public which rejected their pre-condemnation will, having seen for itself, flock to their bias and demand return of the admission money? Or are they trying to preserve their jobs?

Several of these experts work seriously at a task impossible by definition: reconciliation of Catholic and Jewish religious beliefs. Catholics believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ. Jews reject Him as a blaspheming heretic worthy of death. There is no middle ground. But these compromisers cite the Second Vatican Council’s *Nostra aetate*, as their justification. We cite the same document as one of many proofs that the Second Vatican Council is not Catholic. Vatican II’s Declaration of the Church’s Relationship to Non-Christian Religions is one long paean of praise for every kind of error, even ascribing holiness to these false religions. It waxes lyrical over Islam and post-Christian Judaism—religions founded on outright rejection of Christ.

The experts prattle on about inconsistencies in the Gospels. These were written not as history but as testimony, and are not bound to any particular sequence. They are, as St. John ended his last two chapters, part of the massive support for the main argument.

20:30-31 Many other signs also did Jesus in the sight of his disciples, which are not written in this book. But these are written, that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God: and that believing, you may have life in his name.

21:25. But there are also many other things which Jesus did which, if they were written every one, the world itself. I think, would not be able to contain the books that should be written.

St. Luke’s Gospel was not written by an eye-witness. Some of his material is not found in the other Gospels. When St. John wrote his Gospel the other three had been read for decades. There was no reason for him to cover the same ground. The Gospels support each other. Incidental differences are not contradictions but rather variations in emphasis or immediate purpose. But the overall purpose of all is the same—that believing, you may have life in His name.

The “scholars” fairy tale version appears firmly grounded in the works of Flavius Josephus and Philo of Alexandria—both contemporary, neither an eye-witness.

The “scholars” repeatedly point out, as though relevant, that the Gospels were all written forty to

seventy years after the events. They were written, nevertheless, by men who had devoted years to preaching the Gospel, as Christ had commanded. He had not told them to write a word. St. Paul said that faith comes by hearing, which is a good thing. Until the invention of printing most people were illiterate. Is it not interesting, however, that fragments of St. Mark's Gospel were found among the Dead Sea Scrolls—stored in those Qumran caves before the destruction of Jerusalem?

Then we find that the producer of *The Passion of the Christ* used other sources to pad out the Gospel accounts. Gospels by themselves are not necessarily anti-Semitic. But look at those horrendous visions of Anne Katherine Emmerich! We have here a nun marked with the Stigmata, the wounds of Christ, who bore incredible suffering, who subsisted for miraculously long spans of time on no food but the Holy Eucharist, charged with joining the anti-Semitism of her day presumably by inventing visions mentioning Jewish blood-sacrifices of Christian children. This is not even suggested in the motion picture, but is supposed to warp it into anti-Semitism. Jews wouldn't do this?

When Constantine put an end to 280 years of persecution, he had to legislate against Jews who murdered members of their own families who had become Christians. Jews stoned St. Stephen to death while Saul held their coats. St. Paul himself catalogued a long list of outrages, and was eventually beheaded as a result of Jewish persecution.

So why this assault on the picture? It has produced no overt anti-Semitic action, even by the Anti-Defamation League's criteria. So keep the pot boiling until some one sickens, and reacts in some manner which can be cited as an instance of this "hate crime?" Will public profession of Christianity automatically draw prosecution? Then we shall enjoy the Soviet Union's vaunted religious freedom. Anyone could believe what he chose—he just couldn't let anyone else know.

* * * * *

Help for the Scholars (against *The Passion of the Christ*) working for Catholic-Jewish Agreement

While I see no hope of reconciling two groups founded on mutually exclusive views of history, I see clarification of these views as a step to final resolution. To this end I present edited excerpts from David Goldstein's *LETTERS: Hebrew-Catholic to Mr. Isaacs*. The author, a member of both religions in the same order, seems the ideal clarifier.

To a Reform Jew Goldstein wrote: "you have ceased to be an Old Testament Jew ... you are not governed by the Law of Moses ... as understood by our forefathers. Reform Judaism is as far from the Mosaic religion in the Old Testament as Unitarianism from the religion of Christ in the New ... Reform Judaism and Unitarianism are alike in principle. ... Alfred Segal, the Jewish columnist, asked: 'What is there in my Reform Temple which I could not get in the Unitarian Church down the street?' (*American Israelite*, 1/14/37.) Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch, Sinai Congregation, Chicago, co-editor of *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, foremost leader of Reform Judaism for four decades, said: 'If ever we come to consult who are our co-religionists, we will discover that we have much more in common with the Unitarians and the Ethical Culture people than with Orthodox Jews.' ... I would agree with your (rephrased) contention, ... no Reformed Jew could consistently (or rather logically) become a Catholic. He would first need to be converted to the basic principles of his fathers in Israel before he could 'consistently' become a Catholic. 1) because the principles of Judaism proper are unchangeable ... not evolutionary as Reform Judaism holds ... 2) a Catholic must believe in miracles, ... that God, the Maker of nature, is above and beyond nature ... can act directly without going through the ordinary, immediate cause leading to effect, which we designate as natural ... 10 O.T. miracles Jews must believe: The Ten Plagues of Egypt, Parting of the waters of the Red Sea, Feeding with manna, Death of Cor, Dathan, Abiram for rebellion against the authority of Moses and Aaron, Budding of Aaron's rod, Feeding of 100 men by Elisha with 20 loaves, Resurrection from the dead by

touching the bones of Elisha, Deliverance of 3 children from the fiery furnace, Deliverance of Daniel from lions, Deliverance of Jonah from sea monster. Reform Judaism denies these, and other miracles, the denial of which relegates the O.T. from the reading desks of synagogues, and the pulpits of churches, to the folklore shelves of libraries. Again, Reform Judaism denies belief in a personal Messiah. This itself is an utter denial of the divine promise around which the Judaism of our fathers of old in Israel centered. Belief in a personal Messiah is the central hope of Israel, for which all true Jews have prayed morning, noon, and night throughout the Jewish ages. ...

“Reform Judaism is a man-made religion; it originated in Germany during the first part of the 19th century. True Judaism is God-made; it dates back to the covenant made by God with Abraham in Ur of the Chaldees 20 centuries before the Christian ages. ... it is plainly evident that ... when it comes to things basic to Judaism—its unchangeable principles, miracles, and belief in a personal Messiah—I, a ‘circumcised Jew’ transformed into a Roman Catholic, am in harmony with the faith of our saintly fathers of old in Israel from Abraham to Moses to Malachi. On the other hand, you are in harmony with Rabbis Samuel Holdheim and Abraham Geiger, of Germany, the ex-Orthodox Jews who originated Reform Judaism, and not with the faith of the Torah Jews of old.”

The first matter to be clarified, then, is with which type of Judaism we attempt to negotiate. If both, at least we should solicit the support of the Unitarians. And the novus ordo Arians? These last obviously already speak for us. Either way, the items to be negotiated appear to be historical facts.

But, according to Goldstein, that is not the end of the matter.

“You, Mr. Isaacs, want ‘democracy in religion, and not a religion governed by a priesthood that claims divine authority.’ ... the issue is not what you want, but what O.T. Jewry requires. ... many fail to discriminate between the authority of the Church, which comes from above, and the exercise of the authority of the state which rightly comes through the consent of the populace. While all power comes from God, the authority of those who exercise such power, in a God-made spiritual society, is made known to men by revelation. It was set forth by Moses, and defined, as occasion necessitated, by the high priests and Sanhedrin for the Jews, and by Jesus Christ and the Church to which He delegated His power, for all the ... world from the time the sojourn of Christ on earth ended. ... a man-made church may not only select its own rabbis or ministers, and govern itself

by the will of the majority, but it may also shape its principles by vote of its membership ... But right reasoning compels the conclusion that a God-made Church if such exists, must be governed by the will of God (as defined by its priestly authority) and not by the will of man ... There is but one infinite God, hence there can be but one Church of God, especially when that Church is the Body of the Lord Jesus, as St. Paul declared ... There was but one spiritual society of God’s making before the 33rd year of Christian reckoning, and that was the Church of the Jews. It ceased to be of God when it ceased to have a priesthood, sacrifices, and a Temple ... Only one organic, visible, spiritual society of God’s making has existed since then; that is the Catholic Church, the one and only Christian Church that dates back historically to the first century of the Christian era. And the Catholic Church would cease to exist if her priesthood and sacrifice were no more, if that were possible. ... The Jewish religious system ... had its Sovereign Pontiffs, its High Priests. It had one visible head in the beginning, Moses, who anointed his brother Aaron as first High Priest, followed by Aaron’s son Eleazar, and in turn by successive first sons of the family of Aaron, who sat on the chair of Moses. ... The Jewish priesthood ceased to speak with authority when the Veil in the Temple was rent, for shortly thereafter, on the First Pentecost Day, the Church of the New Dispensation began to function. The Jewish priesthood lived out a precarious existence without divine authority until the destruction of the Temple in the year 70

A.D. ... A Jewish religion without a divine priesthood ... is like a horse without a bridle; there is no telling into what doctrinal road it **will run. Lack of coherent, priestly authority accounts for Jewry's doctrinal intellectual chaos. It fails to agree on the simple primary questions, 'What is a Jew?' 'What is Judaism?' ... When will you realize that the Judaism which added glory to Israel—the Judaism of the priestly days of Israel—is no more?"**

So the postconciliar "Church" negotiates with a laicized, indefinable, unidentifiable, unrepresentative "Judaism" which has neither credentials for negotiation nor consistent principles from which to negotiate. Goldstein elaborates:

"Heinrich Graetz, Jewry's leading historian, says: 'Without the altar, it seemed as though it were impossible to approach God, or as though God had forsaken his people. The festive seasons used to be determined by the Sanhedrin. But the Sanhedrin was no more; who was to regulate and announce the time for the festivals?' There came forth Rabban Johanan ben Zaccai. He set up a Sanhedrin (Vol 2, p 248). 'By transferring the Sanhedrin to Jamnai (a coastal town south of Jaffa), and separating its functions from the temple site, Rabban Johanan likewise separated Judaism from the sacrificial cult and made it independent.' ... Here are two of a couple of dozen quotations, taken from Jewish writings, which prove that Judaism as a divine, authoritative, priestly sacrificial religion had ended with destruction of the Temple, an event that took place before Rabban Zaccai abrogated the unabrogable sacrifices, and assumed to substitute prayers ... Encyclopedia of Jewish Knowledge: 'The fall of the Temple and the disappearance of the high priesthood occurring at the same time, that form of intercession, ground for possible belief in human symbols of divine authority, vanished. Nothing remained but the sublime faith in the indivisible, omnipresent Creator' (p. 364) & Mid Channel, by Ludwig Lewissohn: 'With the destruction of the Temple the sacrificial cult of the Jews was destroyed. For among the people there was but one temple and one altar. Hence the Jewish people were suddenly laicized. Priests and sacrifices and tangible mysteries were no more' (p. 259)."

These quotations can easily be adapted to fit the postconciliar "Church." So the sides are equally qualified to compromise with each other. Let them have at it!

* * * * *

Legislation that would make Holocaust-denial committed overseas an offense under Israeli jurisdiction was approved unanimously by the Knesset 7/20/04.

What point has this legislation unless other governments permit their citizens to be extradited or kidnapped into Israeli jurisdiction?

\$\$PX on Sedevacantism

The 3-year-old flyer from \$\$PX Canada translated for re-issue in Ireland is no more correct than the French version. Its first mistake is definition. Sedevacantism, not a theory, is recognition of the fact that we have had no pope that we knew of since Pius XII. It is not a reaction to the "very grave crisis" in the Church, but rather appreciation of the fact that men ineligible for the papacy by reason of public heresy and/or apostasy have usurped the Holy See, driven out our Mass and sacraments of divine institution, replaced them with man-made (invalid) innovations, and destroyed the four marks of the Church.

"Do sedevacantists agree amongst themselves? No far from it." Do *novus ordo* clergy and laity agree among themselves? Of course not! This is one indication that we have no visible pope. A pope is our standard of unity. All needed is agreement with our pope—on which day of which year? The scattered and shattered twit the sedevacantist for their own universal problem.

So is the *novus ordo* Church ONE? Worshipping differently is it ONE with the Church of the ages? With invalid and idolatrous substitutes for Mass and sacraments, is the *novus ordo* Church HOLY? With a new set of Canon Laws and a new official Catechism is it the same Church? Is it CATHOLIC?—the same everywhere at all times? With its ecumenism and resultant death of the

missionary effort, is it APOSTOLIC?

We are then treated to a rogues' gallery of impossible popes. ("This is where sedevacantism leads.") No, this is human nature filling a recognized vacuum. Some people really believe that the Church cannot survive without a pope, and feel obliged, to the best of their ability, to supply one—thus supplying for a deficiency in Christ's Church.

Although we know that the current "pope" is an antipope, others believe him partly pope, a pope "*materialiter*" but not "*formaliter*." And \$\$\$X insists on having a pope to ignore or disobey.

Now some of us refuse to assist at Mass in which the priest prays for the pope. In what prayer? No Catholic may assist at any kind of worship in which he prays **in union with** (*una cum*) public heretics, apostates, or antipopes. We pray for anyone we please, privately or publicly, but we won't recognize an antipope as pope.

Our main difficulty (so good of \$\$\$X to diagnose!) is explanation of how the Church can continue visibly to exist while deprived of a visible head. So every time a pope dies the Church ceases to exist? Until 1958 we had 69 interregna of two months or more, one of nearly four years, and the Church survived. So who sets the limit? Visibility is certainly confined, but to how many non-Catholics (including the *novus ordo* types) must a pope be visible?

Then St. Robert Bellarmine is cited as teaching that a pope who would formally and manifestly become a heretic would lose the pontificate, as though Canons 188 and 2314 of the 1917 Code did not exist, nor the much older *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio* with which these canons agree—necessarily! Ignoring the law, for the nonce, they try to withdraw its fangs with the downright silly argument that "But if John Paul II often enough makes heretical affirmations (like saying the wrong Creed with a Greek Orthodox Patriarch) or statements that lead to heresy, it cannot be easily shown that *he is aware* of rejecting any dogma of the Church." What price awareness? What has happened to Papal Infallibility? Can a man without infallibility in the field of faith and morals be pope? "As long as there is no sure proof..." Did he not sign the decrees and documents of The Second Vatican Council? Did he not dedicate his "pontificate" to the continued implementation of its innovations? Was he not therefore ineligible for all offices in the Church?

"For him to lose jurisdiction, the Catholic bishops (How many?) would have to make a declaration denouncing the pope's heresy." Do not the laws we cite read "*ipso facto*, without any declaration?" But \$\$\$X uses and teaches the antipope's 1983 canon laws, all 1752 of them. Even could this new code be legitimate, JP2's heresies cited above were public and notorious during the undoubted applicability of the 1917 Code.

"According to the more common opinion, Our Lord ... continues to give jurisdiction to an even manifestly heretical pope (a contradiction in terms) until such time as he should be declared a manifest heretic by the Church. Now, in so serious a matter, it is not prudent to go against the common opinion." Not only is the opinion wrong, but it is irrelevant. The whole situation is covered by the law, which made Wojtyla ineligible for his usurped offices in the first place. The law states unequivocally that a heretic can hold no office in the Church.

"Sedevacantists base their position on the Apostolic Constitution (Is it here implied that being an Apostolic Constitution it is not a law?) *Cum Ex Apostolatus* of Pope Paul IV. But some good(?) studies have shown that this constitution lost its legal force when the 1917 Code of Canon Law was promulgated."

From the 1917-18 Code of Canon Law:

Canon 6 (6): "All other disciplinary laws of the old law which were in force until now, and

which are neither explicitly nor implicitly contained in the Code, have lost all force of law **with the exception of laws contained in the approved liturgical books and laws derived from the natural and positive divine law.**”

The Code itself legislated nothing new; it summed up existing law.

Canon 23: In doubt whether the former law has been revoked, the repeal of the law is not to be presumed, but the more recent laws are to be, as far as possible, **reconciled with the former laws so that one may supplement and not contradict the other.**

Charles B. Augustin’s **A Commentary on the New Code of Canon Law**: “This canon expresses the law of continuity in the legislation of the Church. It would be unwarranted to assume ... that the new Code came into being like a *Deus ex machina* and that an insurmountable wall is now erected between the *Corpus Juris Canonici* (in a wider sense) and the Code. The sources (*fontes*) quoted will show the continuity of legislation.”

Canons 188(4) and 2314 §1, therefore, are to be read in concordance with *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*, which they abbreviate— not supersede.

Canon 2314, *1: “All apostates from the Christian faith and each and every heretic or schismatic incur the following penalties: (1) ipso facto excommunication; ... Canon 188, *4, provides, moreover, that the cleric who publicly abandons the Catholic faith loses every ecclesiastical office *ipso facto* and without any declaration.”

The \$\$\$PX translated article continues its supreme irrelevance to the bitter end, even appealing to *novus ordo* “theologians.” Sedevacantism is imprudent to hold, and forbidden to \$\$\$PX members by Lefebvre. He above all would realize that his funding would vanish.

* * * * *

Another Sedevacacantist Bites the Dust? Richard Ibranyi, the Grand Inquisitor, has recently published an argument in favor of the postconciliar “sacraments.” He prevails over selected discussions of selected opponents (whom he just may quote properly, without his usual omissions) by the simple means of stating that each of these new “sacraments” contains proper matter, form, and intention. He does not even try to demonstrate the competence of their imposers. He appears to grant the imposers’ competence in the divine field of sacramental institution. All these changes were introduced since—and supposedly by order of—the Second Vatican Council, by a “pope” of, and committed to, the Second Vatican Council. Illegally convoked by incompetent authority for the obvious purpose of essential change in the unchangeable Church, this Council had neither right nor power to innovate or to order innovation. Nor had antipopes, or other diabolic or human agency. To argue validity of postconciliar “sacraments” on Ibranyi’s grounds is to concede the legitimacy and **divinity**(!) of both the Second Vatican Council and the antipopes who convoked and “obeyed” it.

* * * * *

Richard J. M. Ibranyi has slandered another victim. He has fastened onto the utterly defenseless Brian Harrison, who misleads seminarians in Porto Rico, and declared him, among other defamatory designations, an apostate! This is the rankest slander.

I met Harrison years ago, shortly after his conversion to the postconciliar “Church.” He has never, to my knowledge, apostatized from that irregular organization, but rather maintains all its foibles and heresies with commendable loyalty.

* * * * *

Strange Effects of *The Passion of the Christ*

In the media attempts to stop distribution of this film, they “discovered” that the producer and his

family were crazy enough to attend Masses outlawed by Rome. We belonged to this schismatic cult that had split off from the Vatican.

It backfired. Many were interested in what had been stolen by John XXIII, his council, and his successors. Rome has now gone into damage control mode. It has resurrected the twenty-year-old *Ecclesia Dei*, by which the laity could request the indult mass in Latin. If their bishop would agree, they could attend John XXIII's 1962 replacement of our traditional Mass, if they would declare that the 1969 "mass" of Freemason Annibale Bugnini promulgated by Paul VI is a valid Mass.

Now with permission we may assist at an approximation of the Mass which the Church is obliged to provide as our right! As an example of Rome's belated care for souls we cite comment by Rev. Thomas Reese, editor of *America* "and an expert on the structure of the Church," on the planned introduction of the indult mass into a dying parish in Detroit, where the young pastor calls it the Tridentine mass.

Reese: "When the pope authorized bishops to allow this mass in 1984, the idea was that this was a pastoral response to older people who are still so attached to this older mass that they need it. The idea was never to create a new desire in people for this mass. ... It would be counterproductive if too many people turn this into a marketing strategy to fill churches. The idea behind allowing this mass was that it could help older people in the later stages of their lives. The hope is that this mass eventually will fade away."

In preparation for the witching hour Cardinal Maida's staff is recruiting priests, and either training or retraining them in Latin. So at least some—possibly all—will have been "ordained" in the 1969 replacement of Holy Orders. We heartily join Reese in the hope that this Roman con game will fade away.

* * * * *

Father McBride's Family Catechism, based on the Catechism of the Catholic Church—enough in itself to damn it—was lent me for perusal. I opened it at the back, and discovered a veritable catechetical jewel:

One day, while walking in early spring in a remote part of the woods, I stopped to pick a wildflower. As I gazed at its delicate beauty, a quiet awe filled my soul. [Awe full?] I found myself saying, "You are so beautiful, and yet no one would have appreciated you if I did not notice you." As I dropped [!] the flower, a thought crossed my mind, "You never stopped to admire a flower before and certainly never talked to a flower." Still, that quiet awe continued to bring a delicate joy to my being. I found myself humming a tune.

Some weeks later I was involved in a time of reflective prayer. I asked the question, "Lord, when were you trying to speak to me this past month?" I reviewed my calendar and reflected on the many ways God had touched me. None of them struck me as the key moment.

Then I remembered the moment with the flower. The Lord spoke, "That quiet awe was [uncharacteristically ungrammatical] Me [seeking an identity?]. I was trying to tell you, 'It's all right to be a flower in the woods.' " [if you are a flower!]

I am a bishop. I have a schedule full of activities—work for the Church, for the Lord (?). I was not accustomed to think of myself as a flower in the woods. I seldom regard myself as one of his masterpieces. To the contrary, I acted as if I needed to earn God's love.

Now, like sunshine breaking through the clouds. (sic) God's light broke the shadows of my

spiritual blindness. I realized that God is pleased with me just the way I am because He loves all of His creation, especially humans. We have the glory of reflecting his image and likeness. Before that moment, I could usually point to some [episcopal?] activity every day that I thought pleased God. Now I see that my activity does not make me beautiful. [Some are just naturally beautiful.] God makes me beautiful. This has made a colossal difference in my life—including my prayer life.

Reflective moments like that are common in my life now. I try to pray this way at least twenty minutes each day. [That's twenty minutes each day not dedicated to destruction!] For the last nine years I have kept a daily record of my reflections. — Bishop Narcissus

Can anyone recommend wrist-stiffening exercises? I can't see this bishop molesting the altar girls. Nor can I appreciate the compiler's motives in including this gem in his—up to that point—sufficiently stultifying Catechism.

Something has gone wrong with the selection process. Formerly we looked upon our clergy as men—though I recall a New York priest's complaint: "We haven't had a bishop (Ordinary) since Hughes."

* * * * *

Absence of Sacred Tradition

When defending the Faith, the early Christians did not quote Scripture, nor any other reason but only the most important: "This is a novelty, something new." This Arian opinion is new! Not inherited, not traditional, not common property but a novelty. Indeed, therefore, it is not true, not Christian, not from the Gospel. The early Christians rejected the notion of 'evolution of dogma,' whereas many 'modern' Catholics are predisposed to 'evolution of faith.' The traditional principle, that all doctrines of faith and morals are present in the Treasure-Deposit of Faith, was known as early as the time of Pope St. Stephen (254-257) who said with assurance: "*Nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est.*" Let nothing be introduced except what has been handed down. (Cyprian, Ep. 74)

Truly it cannot be imagined that the early Christians would ever have accepted the destruction of any basic traditional doctrine for a new change. When the Church Fathers debated with Arians, their strongest argument was that they could not find in the past any such standpoint; there is not even a mention of Arian teaching before! Otherwise, if the evolution of doctrine was real, then, at some time Christianity was at least part Arian. Interesting that these heretics never answered this.

They came up with false ideas or explanations only. For examples: Alexander of Alexandria, the earliest defender: "They don't like when we quote the old Fathers, our teachers from the beginning. These Arians want to hear not even their names. They insist that they have discovered the right idea, but they put forward revelations totally new, which no one had ever heard of before." (Ad Alex. Byz. Ep.)

St. Athanasius was an incisive defender against Arian heresy, saying: "We show you how our Faith has come from our great-grand Fathers to our Fathers and from our Fathers to us. Then you are a new kind of 'Jews.' Can you show us one of the ancient Fathers, only one, who is with you and perhaps did teach your heresy. You cannot name one. All are very far from you." (De decr. Nicaenae Syn. 27)

Indeed the main point of every debate, every argument was: Holy Mother Church was attached to the Christian doctrine, which consisted only of that which the 'Fathers' taught from the beginning.. For of their teaching, and their doctrines there was no doubt.

Their early teaching is true today also. In the Apostolic Fathers' Faith, in the earliest-deposit of our Faith: our Lord is divine and our doctrine is original; there is no place for 'evolution' at all.

— Bela Bangha, S.J., The Proofs of Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, Budapest, Hungary, 1923

* * * * *

In the Houston area, a man whose family has lived two centuries on his property recently answered

the door to two Moslems, who informed him that they had just purchased the property next door to erect a mosque. They suggested that he look around for a place to move his business, because they would soon expand. The matter even came up before a local government meeting, at which both parties attended. Not surprisingly, the local clergy came down on the Moslem side.

The man thus threatened has now set up a series of pigsties on the Moslem property line, and holds pig races there every Friday evening. Here is an opportunity for Silvio. To enter his birds in the races, he need only amputate the last three letters off each. They should win in a walk.

* * * * *

The Oratory Catechism. Roman Catholic Catechism and Instructions for the Faithful in Today's World, 416 pages, ISBN 3- 928198-02-5. Publisher: SAKA-Verlag Saarbrücken 2000 Available also in French and German. For further information: www.oratorium-editor.de

This catechism addresses nearly all the problems created by The Second Vatican Council and its postconciliar implementation. The author does not insult our intelligence by pretense that Rome and its government are Catholic. "... the highest offices of the Church have been allowed to be taken over by powers at enmity with the Faith. ...false teachers and unbelievers have falsified divine revelation & the teaching of the Holy Church."

"In these days of seduction by the New Rome, every Christian must give an account of how he kept the true Faith until the end." Read the page of brief excerpts amply developed in the book. This catechism provides a far more realistic picture of the state of the Church than our "traditional" press. One trad has recently editorialized:

"Join Francis Cardinal Arinze, Marcus Grodi, and Christendom's Faculty as they celebrate 25 glorious years of Pope John Paul II's Pontificate." [An ad]
"... isn't it a tad overdone to call the last 25 years 'glorious' ...? ... Even [JP2] himself recently had the good grace to question his own lack of governance ... not a mere observer... he was the man in charge! ... "a decadent bureaucracy stands where once stood the noble hierarchy ...we've endured a 25-year-long ... nightmare, marked by spiritual annihilation, church closings, scandals and a mass exodus of nuns ... the priesthood has become a hotbed of sodomites, thanks ... to the laxity of the hierarchy and their 'new and improved' seminaries, all imbued with the 'reforms' of Vatican II. ... the Church has been dragged to the brink of collapse over these 25 years. And as one who prays for Pope John Paul every night, I ask with all due respect [for the usurper]: What 'glorious' accomplishments are we talking about? Trips to Denver? Verbose encyclicals that few Catholics bothered to slog through and even fewer understood? Altar girls? Communion in the hand? Bob Dylan concerts inside the Vatican? Assisi scandals? The fact that the Vicar of Christ, the Successor of St. Peter, the visible head of the Catholic Church doesn't approve of abortion? ... Surely we haven't sunk so low into the cesspool of mediocrity that even just being pro-life—a given for a true Catholic— is a mark of greatness.

"The governing policies [?] of this pontificate can only be said to have failed, and history will record that failure ... every available statistic and indicator brings it out. ... it simply cannot be denied that the Church under [JP2's] watch went from bad to worse. He traveled the globe and

said many good things, but he also relaxed discipline and refused to rule. Even now he's promoting the same hackneyed policies ... He praises the failed Second Vatican Council *ad nauseam*; he lauds the disastrous ecumenical debacle; waxes rhapsodic about the diabolic liturgical revolution which has left millions spiritually marooned because it produced a liturgy which even ... Ratzinger calls a 'fabrication, a banal on-the-spot product.' ... churches close by the dozen, the well of priestly vocations is fast running dry, children are no longer taught how to say a Hail Mary in most Catholic schools (let alone their catechism), Sunday Mass attendance numbers plummet ... and [JP2] seems utterly flummoxed as to what to do about it, other than to schedule another trip ... the smothering nuclear winter that's exterminating the Catholic world is, for [JP2], a 'new springtime.' ... what could be more terrifying ... than to look to the Pope ... and see a wandering idealist, muttering about his visions from the sixties and seeing spring?

“... this frozen tundra isn't all his fault? ... [Then whose?] But last month Cardinal Law, overseer of the most egregious priest/sex scandal cover-up in history, was promoted to a prestigious [lucrative] Roman position by none other than [JP2] himself. [Could] this man appear less concerned about what is happening to his children? He either contributed handily to the auto-destruction or did absolutely nothing to stop it—either way, what – are – we – celebrating?” [A quarter-century of unprecedented decay!]

Are these fruits from a good tree? Here we see a short-list culled from far more serious offenses against the devastated Church. The man in charge has at every turn with most remarkable consistency worked against the Church. He has averaged four journeys annually down the wrong roads. He has never missed an opportunity, wherever he wandered in his permanent travelogue, to disgrace his usurped office. His every public word or act has benefited some enemy at our expense. From his day of usurpation he has dedicated his pseudo-pontificate to the further implementation of the disastrous documents of Vatican II, which he had signed, thereby proving himself publicly in heresy, thus losing all offices in the Church. He was thus, like his immediate predecessors, ineligible for the papacy. We have this obvious impostor-usurper working openly against the Catholic Church to the point of spiritual annihilation, and a “traditional” editor publicizing his crimes while maintaining respect for his legitimate papacy.

The Oratory Catechism

Recent mail brought the above title translated from the German of Professor Doctor Wigand Siebel. He has been in our war longer than I. I reprinted part of one of his articles in The Latin Mass Society of Australia Quarterly Newsletter (in the early seventies). We have never corresponded. So far as I know, he has never seen anything I wrote. According to his Catechism we appear to agree on all but a few undefined matters. If I am a nut, I am not a lone nut. Please read these skeletonized replies to numbered questions on pages 337-356 in his Oratory Catechism.

694. A fundamental revision has been undertaken in the new rite of Holy Orders ...

695. The forms for conferring all three sacramental Orders have changed. ...

696. A faithful Catholic must not accept the new Holy Orders since all three are invalid.

700. Only the rites of baptism and marriage are valid under the new rites; all others are either invalid or of dubious validity.

[He regards the Roman Canon in Latin as dubiously valid.]

701. It is strictly forbidden to administer or receive a dubious sacrament. Both are mortal sins. It is also forbidden on pain of mortal sin to receive sacraments by a dubiously ordained priest.

702. The common denominator among the new rites is that they can be better accepted by Protestants and are less clear in expressing the sacramental effect.

703. In view of the heresies and the falsified Sacraments, it is absolutely impossible that the New Rome is still the Catholic Church. ...

704. The New Rome has formed a totally different community—one which only acts as if it

were the Catholic Church. In fact, however, an Anti-Church has arisen. ...

706. The Roman-ecumenical church came into being with Vatican II.

707. Vatican II was a revolutionary uprising against the Catholic Church and her tradition. With Vatican II's decrees ... the false doctrines of Adaptation to the World, of Liberalism, and of Ecumenism were proclaimed. These deviate utterly from the Catholic Faith and the Church's teachings. Thus the whole of Vatican II is to be seen as a means by which the faithful are to be alienated from their Faith in order to then lead them into the Anti-Church of an all-encompassing unified world religion.

708. ... the decrees were accepted by the vast majority of the bishops and confirmed by Paul VI ... The decrees must also correspond with Catholic doctrine and be confirmed by a true Pope. ... general approval and majorities are never a proof of Truth.

709. The Declaration on Religious Liberty ... stands in clear opposition to the final ex cathedra decision of Pope Pius IX, who condemned the idea of Religious Liberty.

Anyone who consented to the Declaration on Religious Liberty in opposition to the former ex cathedra decision was thereby a heretic or at least a schismatic outside the Catholic Church. Thus, the Anti-church was founded by the majority of bishops at Vatican II. Most of the faithful have blindly followed these bishops.

710. The founding of the Roman-ecumenical church has resulted in the purposeful destruction of Catholic teaching and the Catholic Sacraments.

711. The destruction of Catholic teaching and the Catholic Sacraments has led to a worldwide apostasy.

712. The Roman-ecumenical church has retained none of the attributes of the Catholic Church.

714. It can happen that many apparently faithful pastors have been seduced and have become "wolves in sheep's clothing." Persecution has always made the Church stronger. This apostasy was possible only because the pastors were seduced by Rome.

715. The most significant propagators of false doctrines are the false pastors who call themselves bishops or Pope. Although theology professors, parish priests, and curates also spread false teachings, the real danger comes from the highest official pastors, who are still trusted by most of the faithful. These find it almost impossible to believe that the Faith is being destroyed from the top down.

717. The most significant means of seduction was a false concept of obedience.

718. False pastors who are schismatics, heretics, or apostates are not members of the Catholic Church.

719. The clearest signs exposing bishops as false pastors are the catechisms for which they are responsible. The Catechism of the Catholic Church, approved June 25, 1992, has been translated into all languages. Ecumenism, Religious Liberty, Universal Salvation, numerous other false teachings on the Faith and the Church, Humanism, and Equal rights are taught in its pages

720. Through schism or heresy, a Pope places himself outside the Church.

723. As soon as a Pope utters a heresy publicly he loses his office—no official judgment is needed.

724. The current leader of the Roman-ecumenical church cannot be regarded as Pope.

725. The sham "Popes" since John XXIII have proclaimed or explicitly accepted all the heresies of Vatican II, including the condemned heresy of Religious Liberty. ... JP2 has taught Universal Salvation, thereby abolishing Christianity as the religion of salvation. ***This is apostasy!***

* * * * *

Establishment of Religion

We are mired in misinformation on Separation of Church and State, misrepresented as a major principle of the U.S. Constitution, which said only that Congress would establish no particular religion. This unlegislated slogan is cited to prevent free public exercise of religion and to divorce morals from government—which then funds wars, abortions, and other crimes with taxes

levied on church members, and supports foreign, even hostile governments with taxes levied on U.S. citizens.

Separation of Church and State is a novelty, never seen in the civilized world. Can anyone imagine King David separated from the Jewish priesthood? Nebuchadnezzar parted from his idols? Saudi Arabia without Islam? A Mikado shorn of Shinto? Or Greece and Rome minus that hierarchy of gods and demigods to which St. Paul referred as devils? Authority, as Christ told Pilate, comes from above—the further above, the more convincing.

From Constantine's time all western civilization leaned on the Catholic Church, though in some areas in more recent centuries indirectly. The Greeks and Protestants never considered separating Church and State. The German princes introduced the formula *cuius regio eius religio*—whose rule his Church. They believed they could not rule an irreligious or divided people.

Unification of Church and State in one person led to loss of rights everywhere. Russians were to follow their czar into a national Church. Englishmen must adhere to Henry's Church. So must the Irish, though not the Scots or Welsh. The Netherlands divided along religious grounds. France and Spain were forced into intolerable situations. American colonies originated in quests for dissident religious autonomy, again overriding minority rights. In the resultant diversity the U.S.

constitution could not cope with an established Church.

The atheistic French and communist revolutions opposed and persecuted religion more fiercely than anyone in all history. These same groups have led the pursuit of one-world government. Country after country has fallen under the yoke of anti-religious governments. Recent American presidents, and even the Vatican, have repeatedly promoted the New World Order.

Europe has gone far on the path to political union. What passes for the Catholic Church, which has always opposed world government other than spiritual, has fallen under a deadly blight, reversed its doctrine, eliminated rites of worship, and changed its approach from converting men to compromising with religions. To achieve one-world government, a one-world religion is required.

Were this my intention, I would target the religion doctrinally and numerically the strongest, the religion constituting the most effective bar to one-world government, infiltrate it, water it down so that all might join without pang of conscience, loss of principle, or change in creed, while persuading its members that this destruction would be only charity in action. I would involve everyone in my program. I would convene all the bishops, point out that we had converted less than a fourth of the world, gull them into believing this our fault, and into accommodating truth to the majority—which is necessarily right.

I would send the bishops home to subvert their clergy, especially those in training. I would reward originality and undermine tradition. I would order destruction of traditional books, and provide replacements. New methods would occasion new content. I would never cease to emphasize that sterling virtue, obedience.

The clergy would involve the laity—select the prominent and hand them the priests' duties and functions. Let them read wretched new translations of rituals. (Translation would disguise every kind of innovation.) Let them finally replace the clergy altogether.

Unleash the brothers and nuns on the world. Let them fade into the laity and disappear. Let the laity take over education. Let the younger generation grow in variety and foolishness, unaware that what they hear under Catholic auspices is not Catholicism. Let more and more learn less and

less, and rejoice in their freedom. Let them participate to the utmost in busy futility and organized idleness—too distracted to appreciate the degradation of their means of salvation.

In the process I would eliminate every doctrine and practice which could conceivably repel Protestants, Jews, Moslems, and satanists. When I disestablish the clergy I avoid problems with feminine priests, celibate priests, priestly training, sacraments, sacramentals, real presence; everyone is equal—won't the Moslems be pleased! When I drop the usual papal renewal of indulgences, won't the Protestants be pleased! When I reintroduce the Passover rite and deny the Holy Trinity in official worship, won't the Jews be pleased! When I stop the missionary effort and broadcast to all that they are also on the highway to salvation, won't all be pleased! When I tearfully apologize to converts from savagery for stealing their cannibal cultures, who can doubt my sincerity and universal charity? What can keep all religions from joining me in an amorphous world religion, a necessity for world government?

What will I have achieved? I would now head the one-world religion. A small step will make me head of the one-world government. I would hold absolute power in opposition to Jesus Christ. Would I not be the Antichrist?

What is this craze for one-world government? Besides violating his oath of office, the president in promoting it displays at least two strange attitudes: 1) Our national government is inadequate; our system is a failure. 2) He is a failure; he can't operate it. But let us have this infinitely more complicated system which can function only by reducing us all to a least common denominator. Is it any wonder that Christ asked whether on His return He would find faith upon the earth?

* * * * *

Taming the wild Lingo

My Irish friends and in-laws are legion. Few of them speak or understand Gaelic, nor had generations of their ancestors. Yet their speech is saturated with Gaelicisms, Gaelic usage, etc. to the point where I can easily maintain that they speak Gaelic with an English vocabulary.

I grew up in the U.S. Midwest, where the bulk of the population is of Continental, not English extraction. Though they had spoken English for over a generation they had the Irish approach to English, to the point where I have sometimes been given their "English" writings to translate. This is especially true of Germans and Polish, with whom I went to school, to teachers of the same background. Very few of these had mastered English; most of them applied their ancestral usage and grammar to an English vocabulary. They are not even aware of this. This is what they hear all about them. You may have noticed it in American writings, especially written by those with Teutonic and Scandinavian names.

You can find the same phenomenon in Quebec, where English is understood but spoken under French influence. I encountered the same linguistic oddity in Fiji with both Indian and indigenous people. I am continually misunderstood in Australia because, though Americans and Australians supposedly speak the same language, they extract different meanings from the same words. Australian English is largely London, even Cockney, and American English originated in Devon, and retains the same accents and pronunciation.

So it comes as no surprise to me that the Apostles, as well as probably the entire population in their quarter of the world, where Greek was the *lingua franca* used by Asiatics of various tongues to communicate with each other, should superimpose their own phrases and usage on the medium in use. Similarly, the Aramaic which they spoke would have absorbed Hebraisms from the language of their ancestors, even were they not of the same family of languages. These

are as likely Semitisms as Hebraisms. I am willing to bet that somewhere in (the book under discussion) is cited that great authority, Joachim Jeremias, who was first in history to advance the idea that Hebrew and/or Aramaic could not distinguish **many** from **all**. Not only could the Almighty God not say what He meant in this most important phrase of His revelation, His institution of the Holy Eucharist, but His Church never understood it either. Strangely enough, He managed to say in the previous sentence: “ALL of ye drink this.”

Both Hebrew and Aramaic have completely dissimilar words signifying many and all. In Aramaic all = *kol*, many = *sagueeia*. I once checked Gesenius for the Hebrew, though irrelevant, and found similar words respectively, though I have lost my notes in this filing system(?).

Josephus, says my antagonist, wrote in Hebrew but was translated into flowing Greek. That, says **The Catholic Encyclopedia**, applies only to his first work. Most of his work was written in Greek. But the Gospels were not translated into flowing but rather simplified Semitic Greek, which indicates that they were never translated, but written in Greek by Semites. Even the “Greek” St. Luke is commonly believed to have come from Antioch, and would have absorbed Semitic usage. Only St. Matthew had any reason to write in Aramaic. Why should the others have abbreviated his work for the Jews? They could speak to the Jews; they wrote for the world.

If there had existed any doubt about *pro multis*, in either meaning or necessity, Pope Benedict XIV settled it long ago in agreement with St. Thomas Aquinas and the Trent (or Roman) Catechism. *De defectibus* and Maurice de la Taille (Thesis XXXV) would have settled the matter for me had I not already been convinced that the entire traditional Action was absolutely necessary for Transubstantiation, therefore for validity. If it can be so mistranslated as to lose its traditional accepted meaning, then vernacular use should be totally forbidden, as other seemingly harmless things have been when perverted. Not one change was necessary. We had a good Mass, and all Catholics could agree every day with their standard of unity, their pope. But Roncalli changed all that.

If the ICEL really intended to get to the original intention of Christ’s “for many” they had some exaggerated idea of their own competence to overrule the Church’s understanding of this phrase from its beginning. Its translation was absolutely wretched in every other aspect; why should it have been correct in this particular phrase? Nobody needed its translation anyway; good translations abounded. It was set up to break down the traditional understanding of the Mass, and to vary Scriptural quotations so that people would no longer remember them properly. Then came the liturgical commissions, one per diocese, to finish the job — to create the great variety, diversity, and anarchy that provided Montini with his excuse to impose a new rite for the sake of the very uniformity he had destroyed.

No pope was ever sacked for misconduct (as advanced by my unidentified antagonist)? He should read up on Benedict IX, who was pope three times, sold his job once (to Gregory VI), and was booted out three times. (He tried to return when his funds ran low after the sale.) The second time Gregory was booted out with him. Gregory simply could find no other way to get rid of Benedict, who had youth, at least, on his side—which is why he could come back so often. But even Benedict never participated in sacred rites with heretics, pagans, and atheists, as has our present usurper —Garrulous Karolus, the Koran Kissers.

* * * * *

The Second Council of Nicaea

Canon 4 ... So if it is discovered that somebody, because of a demand for gold or something similar, or because of some private infatuation of his own, has excluded from the liturgy or

excommunicated one of the clerics under his authority, or has closed off one of the holy churches, preventing the celebration of God's liturgies in it, pouring out his own madness against insensible things, then he is truly senseless himself and he should be subjected to suffer what he would inflict and the penalty imposed by him will turn upon his own head, because he has transgressed both the law of God and the rulings of the apostles. ...

* * * * *

Osteo-Betrayal

In a New York Times date-lined Vatican City article by Ian Fisher, we discover that Garrulous Karolus the Koran Kisser "returned" the bones of two *fourth-century* Catholic bishops to the Orthodox Church, which has existed in multiple from the *ninth* or *eleventh century*. This is a wider spread than reparations paid by the present government of Germany to the government of Israel for alleged crimes committed by Hitler's government at a time when neither payer nor payee existed.

This treason, betrayal of a Father and a Doctor of the Church to schismatics was conducted Saturday, November 25 in St. Peter's Basilica, where GKKK and Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I each sat at an altar of his own and spoke of reconciliation, "one in a series of gestures aimed at healing a millennium of distance and distrust between the church's Eastern and Western rites."

The Catholic Church has always had Eastern and Western rites within the one communion. The split is not ritual; it is schismatic in that the so-called Orthodox refuse to recognize the pope as Christ's Vicar, and heretical in its disbelief that the Holy Ghost proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son (*filioque*). If GKKK wished to allow the return of the remains of St. John Chrysostom and St. Gregory of Nazianzus to Constantinople where they had been Patriarchs, he could surely have unearthed a priest or bishop in communion with Rome to receive them. But this could hardly be touted "as a gesture of reconciliation."

"Both sets of remains had been interred for centuries, and were carried Saturday in elaborate boxes with yellow velvet to be blessed both by [GKKK] and Bartholomew I." There was no report on how fast the saints' bones revolved.

Edwin Pentin reports in the National Catholic Register that "Cardinal" Walter Kasper has generally edited an account of a Roman symposium of twenty-six "experts" in May 2003, *The Petrine Ministry – Catholics and Orthodox in Dialogue*. "This problem of Primacy is behind many other concrete problems and therefore we are stumbling on this problem – we cannot avoid it. We could not solve all the problems ... But we did take some first steps."

"This is an extremely important book," said Metropolitan Joannis Zizioulas, "we are entering a new era ..." thanks to [GKKK's] "very deep ecumenical spirit."

The symposium was a direct response to the 1995 encyclical *Ut unum sint*, which, in the interests of Christian unity, asked other sects to "suggest possible reform of the papacy." The dogma of papal infallibility was not questioned, said Kasper, but consideration was given "forms in which it could be altered." [necessarily into heresy!]

Zizioulas: a matter of faith, not of dogma and canon law. A universal primate "can only function successfully and openly in the context of communion which respects otherness and difference."

[Papal infallibility is restricted to dogma and morals, in which otherness and difference constitute heresy.]

Not discussed were charges by the Russian Orthodox that the Catholic Church has been taking advantage of the “fall of communism” by proselytizing in the Ukraine. Kasper has, he said, created a commission at the local level to tackle the dispute. If proven cases of proselytism are discovered [O fie!] that call on Rome to intervene “we will do it,” he promised, but he warned against the Orthodox making false accusations.

What price the fourth mark of the real Catholic Church: it is **Apostolic**?

* * * * *

Baptism is a Sacrament which cleanses us from original sin, makes us Christians, children of God, and heirs of heaven. – Baltimore Catechism

Brisbane Archbp. John Bathersby recently ordered re-baptism of hundreds in a local parish for defect of form. Pastor Peter Kennedy and curate Terry Fitzpatrick had regularly substituted *in the name of the Creator, the Liberator, and the Sustainer* for the usual *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*.

Kennedy refuses to believe that he has invalidated the sacrament, but will conform rather than lose his parish, which has served as venue for Gay Pride Festival events, and has welcomed (Aug. 25) “gay” priest James Allison (London) to conduct a forum on gay and lesbian Catholics, complete with a choir of the same sodomite persuasion. Kennedy also has a mythical problem: *right-wingers who have the ear of Rome*. These seemingly take notes when Kennedy invents Eucharistic Prayers. Bugnini could do it; why not Kennedy?

If one complains of clerical oddities he should furnish solid evidence. But Bathersby calls this spying on an act of worship, despite his admission that worship is not too orthodox at St. Mary’s. Kennedy objects that these note-taking right-wingers have no respect for the Mass or the liturgy.

* * * * *

THE WAR IS NOW! No. 64, June 2005

The Seat is Still Vacant. For the fifth time in a row, we have no pope. Five successive Roman Conclaves have presented ineligible. The latest is doubly ineligible. Not only is he a public heretic, he is not even a bishop. But he cannot be properly consecrated without admitting that the 1969 rite of ordination is invalid. So what excuse has the Catholic Church for invalid sacraments? How can it be the Catholic Church? How can the Bishop of Rome not be a bishop? This is in the same class with how can a heretic be pope? Can something be wrong? How long has it been wrong? We need a distraction!

Pappa Ratzl will rise to the occasion. Watch out for the pinch! He has acquired a reputation as a conservative. He has deplored the imposition of the novus ordo missae. He will make readily available the indult mass—now that most priests cannot perform it. They are also victims of the new rite of ordination. They can stand there and try, but they lack the sacramental power to transubstantiate. The net result is not mass, but rather mass idolatry. We need a distraction!

So we negotiate with the Society of St. Pius X. Ratzl and Schmidberger will negotiate in their native tongue. SSPX will achieve regularity, jurisdiction, and recognition of its invalid ordinations. It will then triumphantly lead its clients into the new “Church” to which it has ever belonged until those episcopal consecrations drew an excommunication. All will be forgiven, and all the little traditionalists will have their “mass” back. But that may not satisfy those who want our Church back. We need a distraction.

So the remaining Catholics will be accused of rocking the boat. Haven’t we been conceded everything we desired? Some may even settle for this compromise as something with which we can live. But it will not change the facts. The Roman apostates are not the Catholic Church. They had no power to innovate, and they have no power to restore. Only their recognition of these facts, followed by their immediate resignation and return of the physical plant will satisfy us. We need a distraction.

So when our numbers have shrunk enough we shall at last be excommunicated, and demonized. We shall be painted terrorists, as though we had defended our civil rights. We may then acquire

what Hilaire Belloc called the fifth mark of the Church. “But if I be asked what sign we may look for to show that the advance of the Faith is at hand, I would answer by a word the modern world has forgotten: Persecution. When that shall once more be at work it will be morning.” – **Survivals and New Arrivals -- Hilaire Belloc**

Hilaire Belloc: Essays of a Catholic Layman in England (1931) Excerpts:

Now, an ingrained habit of the defensive is a prime condition of defeat. There is no such thing as a defensive battle or a defensive campaign, save in the sense that one may begin on the defensive, but only with the fixed object of turning to the offensive at the right moment. It was not the learning, still less the logic, of our enemies which gave them such strength; it was the defensive mood into which Catholic apologists allowed themselves to be manouvered.

Details must be dealt with; exposure of our opponents’ ignorance on details is valuable to obtain. But allowing ourselves to be pinned to details involves a loss of power and is not the way to conduct a struggle. Through entanglement in detail we suffer the further weakness of allowing much to go by default. We are so much occupied with special points that false statement on others escapes attention and is let pass. A mass of such runs through all attacks in detail. If the habit of the defensive involves us in all this weakness, the lesson is that the counteroffensive should now be our policy. We have every reason for undertaking it.

The instruments with which to act are ready to our hands. But we shall use them without effect unless we act upon certain directives, unless we are inspired by certain rules, firstly, a spirit of hostility—that spirit of the offensive without which a counterattack fails. We must look with suspicion upon every statement—still more upon the main tendencies which we instinctively feel opposed to Catholic truth, even where they do not overtly attack that truth. We must not begin by accepting the bulk of the official stuff and then see where we can pick holes in it. We must rather set out with a general suspicion of the whole cargo. We must treat the matter as we would treat the statement of a man often discovered in falsehood or unpardonable ignorance. We must look equally narrowly for that master weapon, suppression of truth.

* * * * *

THE WAR IS NOW! No. 65, September 2005

Excerpts from *Nikita Roncalli*, by Franco Bellegrandi (used with permission)

The Pope seemed to have died satisfied. And all those around the body ... seemed pervaded by that sense of ineffable serenity. Certainly, I thought, the device of the exchange had worked wonders, and the bandwagon of the Church had taken, with a big shake, the desired track, no longer the one that ran straight and glistening toward the horizon, but thrust itself ... implacably to the left, forcefully headed into the gloom of a tunnel whose exit was an insoluble and frightening question mark.

Perhaps, for the first time in the modern history of the Church, had punctually had come about, as anticipated, the rapid, unsettling shifting of the pieces on the board ... by secular tradition very prudent and hermetic. In the Vatican’s high spheres it was indeed no secret that after Pius XII, the Conclave would elect Venice’s patriarch Roncalli, who, in turn, would “bring” to the See of Peter Giovanni Battista Montini. From Milan, the Brescian bishop with the owl-gaze, whom in Rome they nicknamed “Hamlet,” or the “Cat,” was pulling the strings of a colossal game, with the precious help of a group of powerful prelates among which distinguished themselves Belgian cardinal Leo Jozef Suenens, Dutch Bernard John Alfrinck, and German Agostino Bea, with the

secret support of international Marxism. That colossal game that would upturn the contents and the aspect of the Church, of Italy, of Europe, and of the whole world with all its established checks and balances, needed, to get in motion and develop, a formidable “battering ram.” This “battering ram” that hit with irresistible violence against the bi-millennarian walls of the Church, shattering their inviolate compactness, was Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli. Behind him the fury of the “New Course” would burst into the vanquished citadel. All had long been predisposed, with precision, so that [Roncalli] would become a breaking Pope. The College of Cardinals was so well guided and oriented, that today, years after that Conclave, it has even been given a more credible version of the little mystery of the three “fumate,” white, black, and again white, which came, in brief sequence, out of the chimney of the Sistine Chapel, causing confusion within the packed crowd ... in St. Peter’s square. In spite of the plans, the Armenian cardinal Agagianian, was elected on the last ballot—hence the first “fumata bianca.” Directly followed by the black smoke, as the elect, giving in to immediate pressures, would decline the appointment, clearing the way for Roncalli, announced by the ultimate white smoke.

... the result that had been established and that the unknowing Catholics would attribute to the Holy Ghost’s intervention. I felt like laughing, as I watched the disheveled and sweating and frantic rushing of the journalists hunting for indiscretions and rash forecasts and the hermetic faces and indefinite grins with which the most eminent princes of the Church resisted, or eluded, their assaults. There was, however, a German journalist, Elisabeth Gerstner, who smelled the truth in the air and, risking accusations of insanity, wrote it and hit the mark. In an article titled “*Zur Todesstunde Pius XII*” that appeared in the *General Anzeiger für den Nieder-Rhein* by mid-October 1958, Gerstner wrote in detail, that the Conclave would elect Venice’s patriarch Roncalli, who would open the door to the future Paul VI. – Chapter I

A fresh testimony on the Roncalli of those years comes from the Cavalcanti Papers. Don Alessandro Cavalcanti (1879-1917) was director of the Sanfedist daily *L’unita Cattolica*, in the heated years of the modernist crisis at the beginning of the century, and as such, tied to certain Vatican high figures. In that important collection of documents are five long letters written by ... Giambattista Mazzoleni (1835-1931) between May and September 1911, in which are analyzed some conferences held by the then professor Roncalli. In the first letter Mazzoleni concludes: “... I was expecting that he would expand on the concept of Christian life, but to me his conference had too strong a flavor of occultism. It also seemed to me to be missing a basis, which is the *abneget seipsum*, disinterested as he was in the evangelical counsels, to begin with. And that calling matrimony ‘sanctification of sexual pleasure’ seems to me a true impropriety to say the least.”

The appointment of Professor Don Roncalli, having been indicated of “dubious orthodoxy,” to the chair of Ecclesiastical History at the Roman Seminary was vetoed in 1912. ... the clamorous and forgotten episode of an intervention of the Holy Office against ... Roncalli put an abrupt end to the teaching by the future John XXIII even at Bergamo’s Seminary. It had been discovered that Roncalli, in defiance of the Encyclical *Pascendi* by his co-regional Pope Sarto, ... not only acted as a modernist, but was corresponding with the excommunicated priest Ernesto Buonaiuti. This priest and historian of the religions was among the major exponents of modernism in Italy, and was excommunicated in 1926 for his progressive activity and his open insubordination to the ecclesiastical hierarchy. ... It comes as no surprise that Roncalli would come into contact with such a champion of modernism. Evidently the *Sodalitium Pianum* had been informed and had conveyed to the Holy Office a detailed denunciation. Conviction and immediate suspension fell on [Roncalli], despite the cautious defense by the bishop. That denunciation, and the consequent intervention by the Holy Office ... were filed in a special section of the Secret Vatican Archives ... where they lay for nearly half a century. [Until John XXIII removed them].

Having become Pope, Roncalli did not refrain from comment, as was his style, on that misadventure of youth and would say, one day in the course of an audience, “For, as you can see, even a priest placed under ‘observation’ by the Holy Office can, on occasion, become Pope!” revealing, in the joke, his deep-rooted scorn of the institutions of the traditional Church. –

Chapter II

Roncalli had sustained and approved [Baron Marsaudon's] appointment to minister of the Order of Malta in Paris. Msgr. Rossi Stockalper (investigating Magistral Visitor) received the ultimate blow when, protesting that Canon 2335 of the Canon Law calls for the excommunication for the affiliated to Freemasonry, he was told by [Msgr. Bruno Heim] that "the nunciature of Paris was working in great secret to reconcile the Catholic Church with Freemasonry." It was 1950!

Count Paolo Sella of Monteluca (economist, politician, writer and journalist, close friend of Umberto of Savoy) shared with me ... evidence in his possession, of the assault by Freemasonry on the Catholic Church. ... : "In September 1958, about seven or eight days before the Conclave, I was at the Sanctuary of Oropa, attending one of the usual dinners at Attilio Botto's, ... That day had been invited a ... high Masonic authority in contact with the Vatican. He told me, driving me home, that "... The next Pope would not be Siri, ... because he was too authoritarian ... They would elect a Pope of conciliation. The choice has already fallen on the patriarch of Venice Roncalli." "Chosen by whom?" "By our Masonic representatives in the Conclave." ... "There are Freemasons in the Conclave?" "Certainly, ... the Church is in our hands." ... "Who, then, is in charge of the Church?" After a brief pause, ... : "No one can say where the upper echelons are. The echelons are occult."

The following day, Count Sella transcribed in an official document, now kept in the safe of a notary, the full name of that character and his stunning statement complete with the year, month, day, and hour. Which days later would turn out absolutely exact. – Chapter IV (end)

Cardinal Lienart, on the morning of the outset of the works, rose at the desk of the presidency, and threw away the mask. He said, in fact, that all the *schemata* predisposed by the members of the Preparatory Commission created by John XXIII on 5 June 1960 with criteria that we might still define traditional, would be rejected *a priori*. In that precise moment the ancient balances were shattered. The true fact of the Council appeared in all its actuality, before the Church, before the Catholics, before the world.

How not recognize Roncalli's tactic? How not to presume, behind that astonishing and decisive action, the favorite method of [Roncalli]? Frankly, we had rather believe in another bold scheme ... than in a defiant initiative that would catch off-guard the shrewd Pope of the Council.

Within the general framework of the Council ... that move was indispensable to push it swiftly toward its objectives. This time Roncalli is the Pope. ... he decides who is to act on his behalf. ... the Church is projected toward an utterly new and different dimension, antithetic to that in which it had remained ... for nearly two thousand years.

* * * * *

How long is an interregnum?

A vacancy of the Holy See lasting for an extended period cannot be held incompatible with Christ's promise to be with His Church to the end of the age.

It would be exceedingly rash to prejudge limits to what God will allow to happen to the Holy See.

These two assertions are distilled from Father Edmund James O'Reilly's 1882 book, *The Relations of the Church to Society—Theological Essays*. Father O'Reilly was named professor of theology at the Catholic University in Dublin on its foundation. He was widely recognized as one of the most erudite and important theologians of his time.

In his chapter, The pastoral office of the Church (page 33), he says:

“... ecclesiastical jurisdiction ... came and comes immediately from God on the fulfillment of certain conditions regarding the persons. Priests having jurisdiction derive it from bishops or the pope. The pope has it immediately from God, on his legitimate election. The legitimacy of his election depends on the observance of the rules established by previous popes regarding such election.”

It follows that in the absence of legitimate election no jurisdiction whatever is granted, neither *de jure* nor *de facto*. Legitimate election of an apostate Freemason or a public heretic is impossible by law. On page 287 Father O'Reilly says:

“A doubtful pope may be really invested with the requisite power; but he has not practically in relation to the Church the same right as a certain pope.—He is not entitled to be acknowledged as Head of the Church, and may be legitimately compelled to desist from his claim.”

This extract comes from one of two chapters devoted to the Council of Constance (1414)—held to end the disastrous schism begun thirty-six years earlier eventually involving three simultaneous claimants to the Papacy, each with a considerable following. Back to O'Reilly:

“... what is to be said of the position ... of the three claimants, and their rights to the Papacy(?) ... In the first place, there was all through, from the death of Gregory XI in 1378, a Pope—with the exception, of course, of the intervals between deaths and elections ...—really invested with the dignity of Vicar of Christ and Head of the Church, whatever opinions might exist among many as to his genuineness; not that an interregnum covering the whole period would have been impossible or inconsistent with the promises of Christ, for this is by no means manifest, but that, as a matter of fact, there was not such an interregnum.”

Thus, one of the great theologians of the nineteenth century, writing subsequently to the 1870 Vatican Council, calls it “by no means manifest” that a thirty-six-year interregnum covering the whole period would have been impossible or inconsistent with the promises of Christ. We can, therefore, legitimately ask: at what stage, if any, would such be manifest? After thirty-seven years? After forty-seven years? Clearly, once it is established in principle that a long interregnum is not incompatible with the promises of Christ, the question, how long?, cannot matter. That is God's decision, as is the time and method of its revelation.

Father O'Reilly continues: “If this schism had not occurred, the hypothesis of such [an event] would appear to many chimerical. They would say it could not be; God would not permit the Church to come into so unhappy a situation. Heresies might spring up and spread and last painfully long, through the fault and to the perdition of their authors and abettors, to the great distress too of the faithful, increased by actual persecution in many places where the heretics were dominant. But that the true Church should remain between thirty and forty years without a thoroughly ascertained Head, and representative of Christ on earth, this would not be. Yet it has been, and we have no guarantee that it will not be again, though we may fervently hope otherwise. ... I would infer ... that we must not be too ready to pronounce on what God may permit. We know with absolute certainty that He will fulfil His promises; not allow anything to occur at variance with them; that He will sustain His Church and enable her to triumph over all enemies and difficulties; that He will give to each of the faithful those graces ... needed for each one's service of Him and attainment of salvation, as He did during the great schism we have been considering, and in all the sufferings and trials which the Church has passed through from the beginning. We may also trust He will do a great deal more than He [has promised]. We may look forward with a cheering probability to exemption for the future from some of the troubles and misfortunes that have befallen in the past. But we, or our successors in future generations of

Christians, shall perhaps see stranger evils than have yet been experienced, even before the immediate approach of that great winding up of all things on earth that will precede the day of judgment. I am not setting up for a prophet, nor pretending to see unhappy wonders, of which I have no knowledge whatever. All I mean to convey is that contingencies regarding the Church, not excluded by divine promises, cannot be regarded as practically impossible, just because they would be terrible and distressing in a very high degree.”

For my thoughts are not your thoughts: nor your ways my ways, saith the Lord. – Isaias 55:8.

[The foregoing article was written by John Daly, and revised and edited by John Lane, October 1999. I have cut their comments considerably, and even omitted a few of Father O’Reilly’s words.]

* * * * *

L’Eglise infiltree par le modernisme (1993) quotes Marcel Lefebvre: “The liturgical reform ... was brought about by Fr. Bugnini; he had prepared it for many years. Already in 1955 [he] had translations of Protestant Liturgical texts prepared by Msgr. Pintonello ... who himself told me that he had translated the Protestant Liturgical books for Bugnini ... at that time still very unimportant.”

Pintonello was Cardinal Siri’s best friend, and supposedly successor in the papacy, according to the Siri theorists.

* * * * *

Greater Dialogue

Our bishops (best hierarchy money can buy) have followed the Second Vatican Council a wee bit further down that broad highway. They’ve voted (151-73) to join a new alliance—“the broadest Christian group ever formed in the United States, linking American evangelicals and Catholics for the first time.”

Bishop Stephen Blaire (Stockton), chairman of the ecumaniacal and inter-religious affairs committee for the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops calls the **Christian Churches Together in the U.S.A.** “a forum for participation so that we can pray together, grow in our understanding together and witness together our faith.” *Whose faith?*

It may never get off the ground; twenty-five members are needed to start the forum. Some evangelical and pentecostal churches have resisted; they worry that such talks risk watering down their faith. It is a sad day when these people can teach our(?) bishops. The report quoted a Baptist parson refusing to bear the yoke with unbelievers.

The War Is Now! No. 66, December 2005

Statement, Utrecht, Epiphany, 2000 (edited)

Pope Paul IV promulgated (15 February 1559) the Bull “*Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*” (by virtue of the Apostolic office), of which only comparatively few have ever heard. Modernist principal executives in the hierarchy who now have everything arranged according to plan, have obviously never wished to disclose their intentions—counter to the Bull.

Despite all attempts to suppress it, that Bull is still in force.

Under it the man, presently and by the world at large, regarded as Pope of the Roman Catholic Church, only pretends to officiate as such. This, because of his deviation from the Faith, before his election as a result of accepting the false doctrines of the so-called “2nd Vatican Council,” and in view of what Pope Paul IV ruled.

Even if he were to abjure his heresies in public, “he will never at any time be able to be restored, returned, reinstated, or rehabilitated to his former status.”

The same applies to all those in the hierarchy who have before their appointment fallen into heresy. “As to those who in any way knowingly receive, defend, favor, or believe and teach their tenets: they shall, among other censures, automatically incur sentence of excommunication.”

This affects not only the whole conciliar church hierarchy, but also those recognizing these heretics as their superiors: the “regular” church-goers as well as most “traditionalists,” among whom both those supporting “Ecône” and those recognizing Karol Wojtyla “only” *materialiter*.
Nicolaas Maria Hettinga

Utrecht, *Sanctae Caeciliae*, '04

Unbelievably arrogant “bishop” McKenna, (edited)

For you arrogate powers you do not possess; the inverted commas convey that you are not a Bishop in the Roman Catholic Church, but, at best, in “the conciliar one”; where you’re “neither here nor there!” For all practical purposes you’re an apostate.

Ten years ago (6 May 1994) I mentioned “your heretical views.” I must now establish that you’re also an inveterate heretic. How dare you, indeed, demand a completely new-fangled idea (*scilicet* “*Papa materialiter*”) to be accepted, as dogma, by your adepts, when we know that “*sede vacante nihil innovetur*.” You’ve also become a schismatic: a tiny remnant of our Lord Jesus Christ’s Mystical Body, has, over this non-issue, split into ever more fragments. You’d therefore better at once, before it is too late, reverse on this road-to-perdition, onto which you’ve also guided all your credulous followers: do so while there is still time!

May Almighty God have mercy on us!

Nicholas Maria Hettinga

Utrecht, 11 November '05, St. Martin of Tours

My dear Enemy! During His last moments on the Cross Our Lord Jesus Christ besought His Father in Heaven to forgive His enemies: “for they know not what they do.” You know very well what you do! You tear members off His Mystical Body with your thesis (presented as if it were a dogma)! ...

The enclosure, dated *Sanctae Caeciliae*, '04 has been waiting for dispatch for almost a year now; it’s about time for you to read its contents. ... (edited)

Nicholas Maria Hettinga

* * * * *

Argument Corner

Objection—Again and again you misinterpret your quotations of Paul VI. They are very often susceptible of suspicion of orthodoxy. – Sexagenarian *novus ordo* priest

Reply—When I read his ambiguities I relate them to his actions and omissions. I grew up in the Catholic Church, which your generation has seen only in childhood.. When these changes began in the sixties I, an educated Catholic, graduate of a seminary high school, and father of ten, went reluctantly along with “my” pope. If vernacular would bring in converts, why not? Never having read John’s *Mater et Magistra*, I was mildly scandalized when *National Review* criticized it under the heading, *Mater Si, Magistra No!*

The Mass translations were literally dreadful, eliciting Bob Considine's comment that they should have been done by some one who understood English and Latin. The changes accumulated to the extent that we who had assisted at Mass for forty years and more needed a “commentator” to tell us when to sit, stand, and even sometimes kneel. And the changes continued, to the point that each Sunday I came out of the church raging. How, I asked, could proper worship of God enrage one who had assisted thereat for fifty years? Nor was I alone. Literally millions left the Church, including at least 100,000 priests, not all of whom were womanizers.

In 1968, at age 50, I moved my family to Australia. We spent ten or eleven weeks in Ireland en route, and never realized that a new rite had come in. I have often wondered how the *novus ordo missae* took over Ireland. It finally hit me when I again visited last year that their vernacular is Gaelic, which most of them barely understand. But it was another way to get back at the English.

In Australia I enrolled my younger children in Catholic schools. A year later I discovered what they were “taught” in religion class, and entered a correspondence with Cardinal Freeman over the heretical content. He referred me to his education department which denied the heresy and referred me to the school. Obtaining no satisfaction, I removed my children and sent them to state schools.

Then Fr. Foulkes, who had said the Latin Mass as modified by John XXIII, retired from the Asquith parish, and I was requested to attend classes because my youngest was to be confirmed. Why? We had a new sacrament! When I objected I was referred to Bishop Thomas Muldoon, the conservative, who asked what formula would suit **me!**

I discovered the **Latin Mass Society of Australia** and the fact that we had a new rite of “mass,” which would be the only rite allowed from late 1972. All my ancestors from the time of St. Patrick had the same Mass and sacraments, but we were to be denied them. Clearly we would not belong to the *Communion of Saints!* I read the decrees and documents of the Second Vatican Council, which confirmed this. Then I saw that the postconciliar “Church” exceeded the heretical V-2 Council in innovation. I soon discovered that the rot was everywhere, and **imposed from the top**. I realized that we had no pope, invisible hierarchy, and few priests, most of whom had not realized that the Church had been hijacked.

I eventually discovered enough feet of clay to classify Paul VI as a centipede. He would not even come to his window to see three years of *Una Voce* rallies in which thousands came to St. Peter’s to support traditional worship, but he romped into a charismatic coven in Rome with hands enthusiastically flung to emphasize his vocal “Hallelujah!” He told the United Nations that it was the last and only hope of the world, in a speech smacking strongly of Freemasonry. He betrayed World War II Italian troops fighting in Russia —and Pius XII’s missionary bishops

sent into Russia.

As Archbishop of Milan he negotiated with the Anglicans.

He replaced our Mass and every sacrament with human, *by definition invalid*, institutions. He thereby involved Catholics in *idolatry*. He consulted a Synod of Bishops on introduction of the *novus ordo missae*, and overrode its decision.

He introduced the *novus ordo missae* as an experiment, and retained it with no public consultation whatsoever, refusing to recognize the enormous drop in “mass” attendance.

He unleashed the new nun.

He wore the ephod (Jewish or Masonic?) instead of his pectoral cross at numerous official functions—some pictured in *L'Osservatore Romano*.

He promoted evolution and world government.

He supported Mandela and destroyed the Portuguese colonies.

He conspired to keep the Council from condemnation of communism.

He minimized fast and abstinence (as old as the Church).

He kept contraception out of the Council, and implied that he would loosen its ban, thus promoting enormous violations. He finally released *Humanae Vitae*, a heavily diluted version of *Casti connubii*, and flaunted it to “prove” his orthodoxy, while he permitted nearly all Episcopal Conferences to oppose it with mere slaps on the wrist.

With all the heretics loose he excommunicated only one priest, Fr. Saenz y Arriaga, the Mexican Jesuit, for writing a book (completely orthodox) **The New Montinian Church**, which documented the Jewish Montini ancestry.

In violation of the papal oath, he innovated and replaced on every possible occasion.

When he came on the scene prepared for him by Roncalli, he found a church under attack, and he dismantled all our defenses. He presided over the worst decline in Church history.

He participated greatly in the plot to “elect” Roncalli, who knew going into the 1958 Conclave that he would emerge as “pope.”

He plotted with Roncalli to succeed him.

He and Roncalli set themselves up as pastoral experts without one single day as parish priests.

They lifted the ban on Freemasonry.

Neither ever did one thing to benefit the Church.

They far exceeded the possibility that all this havoc was accidental—which is, in any case, theologically impossible. **It was deliberately wrought.**

Objection—In *Argument Corner*, The War Is Now! # 66, you dodged the issue. You were to prove Montini a heretic before he was pope. You misstated my *Objection*.

– Sexagenarian *novus ordo* priest

Reply—He was the same heretic before and after election. I need prove only one heresy. Several years ago I revisited my old seminary. In the course of conversation with an old classmate, I mentioned that conciliar document, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (on the Liturgy). He interrupted: “*Pure Protestantism! Pure Protestantism!*” This document is so interwoven with heresy that it requires an act of supererogation to winnow it out. Now this was approved by the Second Vatican Council and forced through by Roncalli, who died before he could promulgate it. There can be no doubt, however, that Montini had signed this display of multiple heresy which so coincided with his own public catalog of faults with our centuries-old traditional worship, which the Council of Trent had declared completely free from error. Then he could not wait to reconvoke the proven heretical Second Vatican Council to promulgate his own heretical views on worship.

The Enemy Is Here! Page 97, pgh. 7 (Montini): “I am determined to place those estranged from us in the forefront of my activity and my prayer. If there is a voice that can reach you, those of you who have left the Church, the first will be one that asks pardon of you. Yes, I of you. When I see the one who has fallen away, there is much remorse. Why is this brother estranged from me? Because he has not been sufficiently loved.” — Christians are the Soul of the World,

Discourse to Milanese Catholic Action, Oct. 15, 1961.

[Such heroic charity to deniers of Christ and His Revelation would ring truer without his Pastoral Letter, **Liturgical Formation**, Milan, 1958, when *Quo primum* undeniably ruled, and such sentiments contravened the law.]

“Christian prayer is a theme as vast as the sea. But the principal form and the one most useful for us is the prayer of the Christian people, considered as a living community and gathered to pay God the tribute of public worship.

“The outward form of our religion must express the inner reality. Our spiritual life must be deepened with new inwardness and new conversation with God. Our religious sense, awakened by the wealth of supernatural truths which our faith possesses, must find its own language, one that is lucid and sincere, strong and authentic, full of truth and of poetry, that we may enter into communication with the ever-present God.

“The liturgy stands today as a central problem of pastoral life.”

Now? Certainly. In 1958 a damnable lie!

“Liturgical prayer must give the Church deeper and more genuine knowledge of itself. It must make the Church more lovable and make it easier to attract souls to the happiness of a new life with God.”

Back to Pius XII: “They see obstacles to the restoration of brotherly unity everywhere, even in the institutions He Himself founded!” Enough sense; Montini:

“There are **still** those who consider the liturgical renewal an optional matter, or one of the numerous devotional currents to which a person may give himself or not as he chooses.....

“Renewal must consist in giving life, that is, understanding, participation and beauty, to liturgical worship. This is what the Church proposes to us. We must seek to understand and **revitalize the authentic elements** that make up liturgical worship; the **divine element first**, and then the instructive and aesthetic elements, with which approved tradition has clothed it.”

[Fine words for change. Montini could pretend he intended to inject nothing more than a new enthusiasm through proper instruction. Not only is such pretense incredible in context, his subsequent actions (especially Bugnini’s promotion/appointment) have betrayed his evil intent.]

“Participation,” he says despite universal experience, “demands understanding. It is a fundamental principle that rites should be understood. This does not prevent their having a content rich in mystery, or having portions that only the priests are to recite. But the understanding of the rite is a rule that flows from the rite itself.”

[Here Montini separates the Mass from the rite and the men from the boys. The boys cannot understand as well as the men, so they are to be presented something simpler, better suited to their childish brains. He never suggests that when simplicity and understanding prevail mystery vanishes. The Mass is in itself a mystery ranking with the Holy Trinity and Incarnation; the best brain ever created could never fathom it. What is this craze for understanding but human, nay, diabolical pride gone amok? Perhaps we should set up an IQ test at the Church door and direct each man in his current state of awareness to a selection of rites which will accommodate him on a given day. Suppose he has overwhelming problems at home, and is partially or totally distracted. What if he has a headache or a hangover? He may even be approaching senility. Naturally in each case he will strive his best to understand it, but he has always known it was beyond him. It is no solution to this deliberately contrived, non-existent problem to remove its innocent cause and substitute a form of worship to fit human understanding. As well cut the power supply to those who can’t construct a generator. Human understanding is not the purpose

of our worship; to satisfy such a purpose removes and destroys divine worship, as well as huge segments of disgusted worshippers. All knew why they assisted at Mass, and understood what took place. Parsing each sentence, not only distracting, was simply unnecessary.] Page 99, line 3

Montini obviously intends to replace our divinely instituted official worship with an obviously invalid man-made substitute. This is obviously beyond papal competence and in violation of the papacy's purpose. Whether Montini subscribed to the oath has no bearing on the case, except possibly to prove his intention to destroy the Church. The best that can be said is that the new "mass" which he imposed drove millions away. Fruits? Heresy is not confined to words, though his words suffice, but includes actions.

The new "mass," aside from its idolatry and invalidity, contains elements of Arianism, Lutheranism, and Judaism, and lacks the three principal parts to which we were obliged on Sundays. This ceremony was perpetrated by Hannibal Bugnini, whom Montini promoted to archbishop as soon as he himself usurped the papacy, in line with his intention publicized in 1958. Please read the following excerpts:

The Enemy Is Here! page 12, lines 22-30 ("The Tridentine Mass Today" (The Australian Catholic Record, 1976, pp. 370-81) by Humphrey O'Leary, C.Ss.R. head of Melbourne's ecumenical Yarra Theological Union, where he lectured in Canon Law.):

The real problem, says O'Leary, is that the Tridentine rite has become the symbol of distaste for recent ecumenical developments and rejection of shifts in doctrinal understanding (a fine euphemism for heresies) which are taken to involve denial of the (newly?) established teachings of the Church. The Mass becomes our battle-ground. This is why we are deprived of our true Mass (So reassuring to know there's a reason.) But in Australia we were deprived long before this opposition for which we are given credit. It took two years to pry out that our Mass was proscribed. Even our hierarchy had more sense than publicly to admit such an absurdity. Let the penalty precede the crime for the crime is inevitable.

The Enemy Is Here! page 50, lines 1-32: Paul VI's public heresy, before and since his election, has made him far less eligible to head a Church to which he cannot belong by reason of his public heresy. Even his present or future abjuration of these heresies cannot render him eligible at the time of his election.

But, it is argued, Catholic doctrine is unchangeable; therefore Paul VI and Vatican II have not taught new Catholic doctrine. Vatican II says in *Lumen Gentium* (51) that it proposes again the decrees of Second Nicaea, and Trent, regarding the Communion of Saints. So where it appears to disagree with Trent what it says must be read in a sense which agrees with Trent. Vatican II, therefore, cannot teach heresy because it said that it intended to adhere to orthodoxy. Similarly, no one was ever cheated in negotiations with Soviet Russia, because communists have all men's welfare at heart.

How is it, then, that we find clearly heretical statements—as well as enormous heretical bias—which appear in every case over the words: "Each and every one of the things set forth in this declaration has won the consent of the Fathers of this most sacred Council. We too, by the apostolic authority conferred on us by Christ, join with the Venerable Fathers in approving, decreeing, and establishing these things in the Holy Spirit, and we direct that what has thus been enacted in synod be published to God's glory?" This promulgation is then dated and signed by one who, standing in the place of Christ, never hesitates to commit Christ to error and call upon the Holy Ghost to guarantee it. Let us give credit where due; such bravery rivals Lucifer's.

But Paul VI, the argument continues, cannot teach heresy *ex cathedra*. (Not being pope he

cannot teach anything *ex cathedra*!) Since he has taught nothing *ex cathedra* he has not taught error. We must take all his ambiguous and heretical pronouncements in a Catholic sense. But these same pronouncements are taken in heretical senses by non-Catholics, who can then say our “Holy Father” agrees with them against us. Furthermore, Paul VI has condoned heresies propounded by “Catholic” theologians by permitting them to continue as “Catholics” to preach these heresies. Catholic authority cannot condone or even tolerate heresy. Heresy kills souls. Catholic authority cannot preach heresy, even unofficially. Therefore, an authority which has done so cannot be Catholic.

The Enemy Is Here! page 95, lines 25-38: (Montini addressed his priests at Varese Feb. 6, 1963) The Church is seeking self-knowledge. But you will say to me: ‘Already for some twenty centuries it has done this.’ I say to you: ‘The knowledge that the Church has of itself is progressive.’ If indeed we are open to the invitation that the Lord makes to us in the Gospel — when, for example, He called on His questioners, His contemporaries, to beware of the signs that approached — it is necessary that we prepare ourselves to see the signs of the times.” He wrote them March 10: “I ask again: what is the Ecumenical Council doing? The Church is seeking itself. With a great and moving effort, it is seeking to define itself, to understand what it truly is. The Church, after twenty centuries of presence in history and in the field of human activity, has come to a moment in which it seems submersed by the creativity, vivacity, and dimensions of modern history. “The Church has felt the need of recollection. It has felt the need of reassembling itself, of fortifying itself, of purifying itself, of reforming itself and of taking up with great courage and with new energy its path through history.”

The Enemy Is Here! page 96, line 12-page 97, line 23 (still March 10 letter): “What then is the Church doing? It seeks not only itself but the world. It seeks to come into new contact with a world that has appropriated to itself the principles of Christianity. The most beautiful—liberty, humanity, **the cult of man**, the respect for the human personality, the desire for peace, the desire for unity—are all Christian principles, which the world has made its own.” “.....We await the manifestation of truth with respect, confidence, and prayer.”

In nineteen centuries truth had not been manifested? But now, in what had already been declared a non-dogmatic, pastoral council, truth at last will out! Elsewhere in the same Letter on the Council, Nov. 18, Montini wrote: “The Council is a Council of positive reforms, rather than of punitive ones; one of exhortation rather than of anathema.” [Not **the world** awaits the council’s explosive manifestation of truth by its modern methods—**We** await manifestation of (new and unmanifested, therefore suspect on its face) truth, perhaps as] Montini preached at Milan Epiphany, 1956:

“Man with respect to God lives in a continuous drama, that of being made for Him, of having need of Him and of being tormented by the quest for Him, and not being able ever adequately to find him. Man will always be aware of his own blindness as gradually God reveals Himself to him as knowable. He will always be more conscious of being able to love God than to know God, and of his duty of desiring Him more than of finding Him.”

[Am I too suspicious in discerning overtones and undertones of Freemasonry and its seeking ritual throughout that paragraph? Or in the next quotation which sets limits on God? Or does Montini refer to Lucifer, the limited masonic god?]

“The Shaper of the universe delights in His own work. God sees Himself reflected in His creatures. He admires their order, movement, beauty, and depth. He hears the canticle, which rises from the cosmos created by Him. He measures the force of His own power and of His own freedom.

“This could be for us, too, an overwhelming meditation: to consider almost with the mind of God the very essence of things. Before it” [almost with the mind of God?] “we remain confounded. Perhaps this confrontation will be the wellspring of the religious summons to the man of tomorrow which the scientific world of yesterday has lost.”—The Christian & Temporal Well-Being, Lenten Pastoral, Milan, 1963.

“The Church will seek to illuminate, by the light of its social doctrine, the way that men of good will take, even in the civil and political sphere. This doctrine—and this should be stressed—rests upon the principle of the perfectibility of mankind and therefore on the idea of progress.”—Religion and Labor, Address to the Workers of the World, Turin, 1960.

“Can there be for each of us in this life an epiphany, a manifestation of God in proportion to our capacity? And looking at the contemporary world this other question immediately comes to mind: Can our age also have its own epiphany, which would correspond to its talents and its capacity?”—Epiphany, 1958, Milan.

[What has capacity to do with Christ’s revelation to all? And what is the point, in the very celebration of Epiphany, of suggesting new epiphanies—new revelations for our age? What other age merited such absurd privilege? Change wildly as some of them did, they all had the sense to keep the original revelation from the Divine Hand. Only the Montinian era deems itself sophisticated enough to reject that for something better, newer, and more authentic.] From the same talk:

“Revelation, I insist, does not of itself oblige. What it announces is not verified by intrinsic evidence.” [*It obliges to the extent that on its acceptance depends our salvation.* “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned.” (Mark XVI, 16) Nor is it “of itself.” It came from Divine Authority.] “The order to which Christianity tends is not static but an order **in continual evolution toward a higher form**; it is equilibrium in motion.” —Easter, 1958.

All this fog is classic modernism, a heresy which you may not recognize because it had taken over the seminaries before you entered them. I have not misinterpreted Montini’s words. He had a private seminary education under a selected modernist Jesuit. All his actions and most of his words, both before and after his usurpation of the papacy, were consistently calculated to weaken the Church and obliterate the faith, which he redefined heretically in one of the above citations. Actually, the only argument you advanced was accurately reflected in my phrase, *susceptible of suspicion of orthodoxy*, as he intended. When he appeared to defend the Church he always did it in such a manner that his argument would not stand analysis. Even *Humanae vitae*, used to establish his “orthodoxy,” watered down Pius XI’s *Casti connubii*. What ever happened to bishops’ conferences which opposed Montini’s inordinately delayed “decision?” Remember that bishops’ conferences receive their agenda and recommended results from Rome—and that if the “pope” had loosened further, the jig could have been up. The whole world might have caught on.

Negotiation with the Anglicans indicated heretical tendencies on the part of an Italian archbishop, who had no business negotiating with anyone as a spokesman for the Catholic Church. What were they discussing? The subjects could be only matters on which Catholics and Anglicans differed, and the Anglicans were wrong! What authority had Montini to compromise—the object of discussion? Though less serious, this is in the class with negotiating with Jews over the central fact of history, on which we and they have always been directly opposed.

Both Roncalli and Montini immeasurably aided our sworn enemies, apostate freemasons. Though Roncalli started the destruction, he did not survive to accomplish it. It was nearly as necessary to elect the heretic, Montini, whom Roncalli made *papabile*, as to include Judas in the Twelve. The havoc was deliberately wrought— by conscious, deliberate wreckers.

Objection—You have not shown that Roncalli or Montini were known public heretics before election. So they were legitimately elected.

Reply—Both were elected conspiratorially *before* the Conclave, as we hope to develop in a forthcoming issue. But let us reason backward: When a man uses his papal prerogative to promulgate heresy, voted in official Ecumenical Council, as Catholic doctrine, he clearly demonstrates that he lacks papal infallibility. Lacking an essential quality of the papacy, he cannot be pope. Considering the fact that a true pope cannot wander into heresy, but is preserved in orthodoxy by the Holy Ghost, how can his election have been legitimate? Can we spring surprises on the Holy Ghost?

Objection—Sede-vacantism, the position that the papacy is vacant for heresy, amounts to a merely personal opinion on the part of some one who applies certain principles of Roman Catholic theology to a specific factual situation.

Reply—Theology may enter the equation in identification of the heresy. Personal opinion is irrelevant. Canon Law has decided the issue. A public heretic can hold no office in the Church. Anyone who recognizes an automatically excommunicated public heretic as pope is equally guilty of the same heresy.

Objection—Theologians of past centuries indicate various ways by which an official decision could be made about the vacancy of the papacy through heresy.

Reply—No official decision is needed. By the fact itself that a cleric publicly adheres to a heresy he loses all offices in the Catholic Church *without any declaration*—as the laws themselves specify. Both the heretic and the faithful are subject to these laws. The heretic is excluded and the faithful must recognize this fact and must refuse to accept or obey him in any way.

Objection—Popes are not subject to Canon Law.

Reply—These particular canon laws are divine law, to which all are subject. They provide that heretics cannot be popes, so that they might be above some laws. They are not mere laws, but undeniable facts. Are popes superior to facts?

Objection—History provides a number of analogies for handling the present situation.

Reply—We need not handle the situation. We need only recognize fact—we have had no pope for fifty years—and act accordingly. Shun and ignore the five usurpers.

THE WAR IS NOW! No. 67, May 2006

In Defense of “Copernican Heretics”

I shall argue in brief that the heliocentric and geocentric positions are not in fact contradictory but complementary. The key idea derives from the *Divina Comedia*, in which a cosmography of the integral cosmos lies concealed. Suffice it to say that Dante envisages the cosmos as a 3-dimensional sphere (a space, at the time, unknown to mathematicians), endowed with a vertical axis, and thus with two poles. The equator, which now constitutes a 2-sphere, marks the threshold of the higher world, the so-called Empyrean. In this cosmography there are thus two poles or centers, the lower of which corresponds to the terrestrial sphere (or if you will, to its center), whereas the higher is depicted as the Throne of God around which the choirs of angels are ranged. Now my point is this: Given that the cosmos constitutes a theophany, the celestial pole must be somehow reflected in the corporeal realm. What is it, then, in this nether world,

that corresponds “analogically” to the celestial pole? When the question is stated thus, the answer is clear: it is indeed the Sun! And in fact, the arrangement of the planets in relation to the Sun mirrors the arrangement of the celestial hierarchies around the Throne of God.

Therein, I say, lies the rationale of what Copernicus refers to as that “wonderful symmetry in the universe” which comes to light when the origin of our co-ordinate system is placed at the center of the Sun.

Two centers, two “unicenter” cosmographies—that is all that can be stated in just a few words. It should suffice, however, to induce the proponents of either theory “to bury the hatchet.”

—Wolfgang Smith

I like this. My hatchet is ready for any eventuality.

* * * * *

What Price Authority?

The Catholic Church has always spoken with the authority of Jesus Christ and His Apostles. When its doctrines are questioned, it always demonstrates that these have been held by all Christians from Apostolic times, based on Apostolic teaching. This was corroborated by uniformity of doctrine in all parts of the known world, though many parts had been taught by only one Apostle.

Everyone bowed to the Church’s authority. All, whether learned or ignorant, educated or unschooled, held the same doctrine. Indeed, it almost seemed a handicap to be highly educated, for from some of these adepts originated heresies. These were detected and condemned by lesser lights, who had the good sense to remain with the Apostolic authority, notoriously during the Arian heresy. The man in the street knew far better than his hierarchy.

The heresiarch could always be charged with attempting to improve on Jesus Christ—an obvious absurdity. But on many occasions the heresiarch’s own brilliance deceived him into believing that he had indeed accomplished this impossibility. He asked himself: “Why do ignoramuses refuse my convincing arguments? Can’t they see that I am brighter than they?” “After all,” presumably thought Arius, “Christ was only human. So why can I not understand things as well as or better than He? What human has achieved perfection?”

But no heresy, from post-Christian Judaism to the sixteenth century revolt, could overcome the Church’s authority and its hold on the great majority. Islam, the closest to success, attained what influence it had, not by superior reason but by superior arms. It lost its superiority shortly after the most successful revolt against authority led by such as Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer. These appear to have shown that they could improve on Jesus Christ and those who wielded His authority.

Where they prevailed, their original monoliths have disintegrated into literally thousands of sects. For heretics from Protestantism cannot be charged with trying to improve on Christ and His Apostles. They, in their brilliance, tried to improve on Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer.

What could be easier?

* * * * *

An Innovation

Innovation = abomination. Imagine, then, what it costs me to dabble in this field. But I have been driven to this. Certain forms of insanity are characterized by an utter absence of a sense of humor. At least five who read **The War Is Now!** have displayed this characteristic, and may, therefore, abstract single lines or phrases from the context of the next two pages to declare me a

blasphemer, lunatic, or heretic.

I have, over the last fifty-odd years, noted the intrusion of all types of lunacy into the Catholic Church (to the point that I cannot recognize it) and into “reasons” for intrusion. The time has come to fight fire with arson. We have at least as much right to lampoon these idiocies as the idiots had to introduce them.

Welcome, then, to this new department,: *Crazy Pages!*

What will awaken the new breed Catholic who insists that the last five usurpers are or have been genuine popes?

Rome has recently, in the person of Msgr Walter Brandmuller of the Pontifical Committee for Historical Research, seriously introduced a novelty absurd enough to activate all the alarm clocks in Christendom. Brandi has discovered that Judas performed a necessary function which contributed to our salvation, and it is only just that he should share in our benefits. And everyone has rights, even the man who scorns and destroys his God-given life, as though it were worthless.

It develops that the above information is denied by the Vatican, and can be blamed on that old debbil, Translator. Or was it just another trial balloon that will eventually fly?

St. Judas will doubtless be proclaimed the patron saint of suicides, whose remains will find a welcome in consecrated ground—if any can be found.

I hope some one explains how this innovation agrees with Holy Scripture, especially with Matthew 26:24. The Son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of him. But woe to that man by whom the Son of man shall be betrayed. It were better for him, if that man had not been born.

“And casting down the pieces of silver in the temple, he departed and went and hanged himself with an halter. But the chief priests having taken the pieces of silver, said: It is not lawful to put them into the corbona, because it is the price of blood.” (Mt 27:5-6) [Legalism here proves malice. The chief priests admit their intent to murder Christ!]

Let us marvel, however, at the incidence of coincidence. How opportune was the recent “discovery” of the “Gospel of Judas,” which suggests that Jesus Christ conspired with Judas to be betrayed, so that, presumably, He could dodge off with Mary Magdalene and institute royalty in France, and get Leonardo Da Vinci to “hide” it in his Last Supper.

Judas, we hear, knew that Jesus could get out of this at any time, so he went right ahead, only to realize that Jesus had double-crossed him. It’s a wonder he didn’t blow his brains out. He could have secured the necessary gunpowder from the three wise men from the East! Obviously he didn’t secure it from the chief priests; transportation costs would have been outrageous, and he had only thirty pieces of silver to his name, except for what he took regularly from the collection, and prospective royalties from his gospel. Never one to miss a trick, he realized that of the twelve only two would write Gospels, and one of them probably not until the next century. So he wrote in a tearing hurry and tore out of the country to avoid plagiarism or worse.

But some one called this to the attention of the eleven. Judas had run out on them. He was certainly absent. One of them suggested that he had lit out for Egypt with this long scroll—or was it a parchment? To which St. Thomas, who would believe anything, exclaimed: “Well, I’ll be hanged!”

“What a great idea!” rejoined several. So that’s the way it has come down to us—because they

all had more sense than to hang themselves. So when do we canonize Judas?

* * * * *

GKKK Kanonization

I have been recently solicited for funds and reasons to canonize John Paul II. I have responded with Joye and enthusiasm, but suggested that the solicitor owes me for cogent favorable arguments.

We all realize how difficult and thorny is the path to salvation, especially since our last five usurpers have replaced the ordinary means. Garrulous Karolus, however, has simplified salvation for both himself and us. By the simple elimination of Purgatory and hell, he has left himself (and us) no alternative to heaven. When he is inevitably canonized he will have infallibly lighted the way to immediate heavenly reward even at our joyous obsequies.

Had he not, in his overwhelming charity, apologized to heathens of all times and places for unwarranted destruction of their savage, cruel, even infanticidal and cannibalistic cultures? In his usurped capacity as Keeper of the Keys, has he not dealt with governments widely known as the most merciless murderers of Christians in all history? At the Second Vatican Council did he not oppose treatment and condemnation of communism on the grounds that *he* had to deal with communists? Has he not provided the finest example of charity to devils at the expense of his own people? Greater love hath no man than that he lay down the lives and liberty of his own people for their enemies! Let nothing stay these parallel canonizations!

What shall we do without Limbo? This could have been our alternative to canonizing GKKK. He was certainly not Catholic, so we might logically question whether he had ever been baptized. And he continually acted and spoke as though he had never attained the use of reason.

Opposed, however, are the Church's latest two guardians of orthodoxy, Levada and Ratzinger, both on record querying the existence of Limbo. Is it logical to support a place intended solely to accommodate people who lack the use of reason? Is this not a species of oxymoron? Or can we call it development of doctrine? Has evolution at last enveloped the inhabitants of this remote region? What will they do? Where will they go? Levada and Ratzinger must provide.

And provide they undoubtedly will—there's a great catch-all in the sky—heaven! But there is also a catch, a bearded Apostle, stationed permanently at the gate, jingling a set of keys. Since the nineteen-forties he has accumulated an unconscionable number of invincibly ignorant volunteers, who congregate inside the gate and quote Leonard Feeney while minutely examining each entry candidate for cool, dripping water. Meanwhile they choose up innumerable sides and try to define invincible ignorance. This distracts St. Peter, who loses his grip on the keys, and suddenly the gates fly open and heaven is deluged with Limboese refugees. The place is awash with unwashed irrationals.

There goes the neighborhood! Wasn't it bad enough when hell and purgatory were cleaned out?

Can Pappa Razzi do this? Let us disregard a tenet or two, and try to pretend that he is a genuine pope. ... thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven. (Matthew 16:18-19)

But Limbo is on the periphery of hell (He descended into hell), outside the above conferred authority. Christ Himself cleared the Limbo of the Fathers, which now lacks purpose. Feeneyites assure me that He spent His time there baptizing all those antediluvians and Hebrews, and even Job, so that they could enter heaven. Dismas, of course, had not yet died.

“Bishop” Williamson Thinks

Let us not actively discourage this process. He may yet display an example of logic. Given enough thoughts, he may, on some unlikely occasion, hit the target.

But as of January 2006 (Angelqueen.org) he has not broken the credibility barrier. He points out a tendency of those who observe the antics of successors of Pope Pius XII to conclude that the Holy See is vacant. But he has his reasons to disagree, as he has previously published. He again assures us that sedevacantism and liberalism are two sides of the same coin. On a former occasion I suggested checking **The Catholic Encyclopedia**, Vol. IX, 212 on Liberalism, condemned by three genuine popes in terms which excommunicate the Liberal for heresy. This time I quote (p. 213d):

“III. CONDEMNATION OF LIBERALISM BY THE CHURCH.—By proclaiming man’s absolute autonomy in the intellectual, moral and social order, Liberalism denies, at least practically, God and supernatural religion. If carried out logically, it leads even to a theoretical denial of God, by putting deified mankind in place of God. It has been censured in the condemnations of

Rationalism and Naturalism. The most solemn condemnation of Naturalism and Rationalism was contained in the Constitution ‘*De fide*’ of the Vatican Council (1870); the most explicit and detailed condemnation, however, was administered to modern Liberalism by Pius IX in the Encyclical ‘*Quanta cura*’ of 8 December, 1864 and the attached Syllabus. Pius X condemned it again in his allocution of 17 April, 1907, and in the Decree of the Congregation of the Inquisition of 3 July, 1907, in which the principal errors of Modernism were rejected and censured in sixty-five propositions.

The older and principally political form of false Liberal Catholicism had been condemned by the Encyclical of Gregory XVI, ‘*Mirari vos*’, of 15 August, 1832 and by many briefs of Pius IX (see Ségur, ‘*Hommage aux Catholiques Libéraux*’, Paris, 1875). The definition of the papal infallibility by the Vatican council was virtually a condemnation of Liberalism. Besides this many recent decisions concern the principal errors of Liberalism. Of great importance in this respect are the allocutions and encyclicals of Pius IX, Leo XIII, and Pius X. ...”

Williamson has never, he says, been a sedevacantist. (But he has admitted that he might be driven to that position.) If the so-called pope is a liberal let us not be unduly concerned. The truth exists, and God will preserve it despite His pope, to whom He grants infallibility as His representative. [What happens to his infallibility as he holds liberal views for which he is excommunicated?] Man is incapable of comprehending many truths. [Is this not why God has revealed them? Must we not know and believe them on His authority? Comprehension varies with the individual—from Aquinas all the way down to Williamson. Can one really believe the infallibility of a pope who teaches error? Can the defined error become true if held by an infallible source?]

“Surely the fact that the latest popes have been tottering is no reason either to follow them regardless or to reject them regardless,” says Williamson. It is surely reason to ignore them. If we must weigh their words and actions to determine truth or falsity, must we not possess infallibility? We must at least possess infallible sources and standards. And we must condemn both the error and its source. If we tolerate them we assume responsibility for them, and if we recognize the source as papal we deny papal infallibility. This removes us from the Church and assures our damnation. The new *pons asinorum*, defended by Horatius Williamson!

* * * * *

Speaking of Condemned Heresies

We hear that we speak too loosely and accuse antipopes of heresies too freely. But we hear this from those who because of their “liberal” education have never encountered the condemnations of these heresies and the anathemas declared against their adherents. A general impression exists among modernists that because these catalogues of modernist errors preceded the 1917 Code of Canon Laws, they were superseded by that 1917 Code, and therefore no longer apply. A syllabus of errors is not a list of laws but a statement of facts—if anyone holds this or that doctrine he is excommunicated. To hold an erroneous doctrine is not directly a violation of the law, but is a denial of our faith. If Joe Blow says such and such he is out of the Church. And the same goes for Paul VI, whose “status” renders it far more necessary for the general welfare to tie him to heresy than to target Joe Blow. If a statement is heretical in 1907 it remains a heresy in 1937, 1957, 1977, or 1997. A man is not excused because he no longer consults his Denzinger. When I first got into this war I could find few priests and no bishops to argue with me; they would argue with themselves thirty, forty, fifty years earlier. Most have left the scene, and their successors sometimes, in their ignorance, try to argue. They have seldom read a Denzinger, and can less often recognize a heresy. They don’t realize when they have lost an argument, nor when they embrace heresy—leave the Church. No priest worth his salt has been raised to what passes for the episcopacy in decades.

THE WAR IS NOW! No. 68, October 2006

1981 Thuc Consecrations

“Some said without any foundation that our consecrations have been invalid because we were consecrated with the new rite;” (Letter of Moises Carmona published throughout the world) These first four witnesses, especially the last who was one of those consecrated, establishes that the New Rite of Ordination was used. Further Fr. Aldolpho Zamora also wrote a letter later on, querying whether or not he was really a bishop.

Des Laurieres was to take his theory on the Papacy with him to his consecration as bishop by Bishop Peter Martin Ngo-Dinh Thuc, whom he had met previously at Econe. Since des Laurieres had not written a condemnation of the New Rite of Ordination similar to the Ottaviani Intervention, one must presume he had no objection to this rite. This is especially true, since it has been reported that Lefebvre used the New Rite on one occasion, and des Laurieres would have participated as a professor at Econe.

Francois Egregyi, *The Thuc-ite Bishops and Their Followers*: As far as the bishops consecrated by Thuc and his “descendants” are concerned, however, not only is it certain that their Consecrations are illegal, but there is also a question mark—at least a small amount of doubt—over the validity of their Consecrations. This is because Guerard des Laurieres himself acknowledged that Thuc had made changes in the ritual of Consecration, omitting several parts. The passages acknowledged to have been omitted are not essential to validity, and one cannot therefore be certain that the Consecration was invalid; but once one is aware that some one changes the ritual of the sacraments,

one can never be sure exactly what he is getting up to, nor what may have happened at other Consecrations of which no records are available.

Who is Msgr. Pierre Ngo-Dinh Thuc? by Father P. Cornelia Byman (The Angelus, April 1983, Volume VI, Number 4): Why such a curious self-criticism, that could be valid only with an affidavit of a physician? It shows that he thinks the opposite beforehand. This is the reason why, in Europe, where Msgr. Thuc is better known, there exists some doubt concerning the validity of those ordinations and consecrations. Validity depends on the mental responsibility of the consecrating bishop.

Some may object that the myriad of evidence proving validity has been omitted. However, what has been provided proves that the New Rite of Ordination was used. Even if one can cast doubt on the evidence, this is the most that can be done. So it is established as a probable opinion that Bishop Peter Martin Ngo-Dinh Thuc used the invalid New Rite of Ordination in the consecration of Des Laurieres.

Therefore the best that can be proven in favor of validity is a probable opinion. However, the Church forbids the use of probable opinions in the validity of the Sacraments, therefore these consecrations must be treated as if they were invalid, until the contrary is proven in the court of the Roman Pontiff.

* * * * *

Clarence Kelly's **The Sacred and the Profane**, chapter 6:

In February of 1988, Fr. Sanborn, Fr. Jenkins and I went to Germany to interview Dr. Hiller and Dr. Heller, the two “witnesses” to the Thuc consecrations, as was mentioned above. We wanted to know if they could verify that the correct matter and form of the Sacrament had been used. For an Episcopal consecration, this is an easy thing to do because in 1947 Pope Pius XII definitively settled the question of what exactly constituted the matter and form of the Sacrament of Holy Orders.

It is not unreasonable to expect that the laymen who were to witness the secret Thuc consecrations would be told what the essential matter and form of the Sacrament are so they could later, in their capacity as witnesses, testify that the correct matter and form had been used. This is especially true in light of the fact that there were no Assistant Priests present to insure that the ‘Roman Pontifical’ was exactly followed. Fr. Heribert Jone in his Moral Theology says: “If possible, two or at least one witness should be present in private Baptism, so that the administration of Baptism can be attested to” (c. 742). “Witnesses should observe everything closely that they may testify to the validity of the Sacrament conferred” (p. 327).

Fr. Jone says that the witnesses to private Baptism “should observe everything closely that they may testify to the validity of the Sacrament conferred.” (Ready Answers in Canon Law, 1954, p. 600.). If witnesses are expected to observe “everything closely” at a private Baptism so “that they may testify to the validity of the Sacrament conferred,” is it unreasonable to expect that the witnesses to a secret Episcopal consecration “should observe everything closely” so “that they may testify to the validity of the consecration?”

Yet Dr. Hiller and Dr. Heller did not do so, and hence they could not testify that the correct matter and form had been used. Dr. Hiller did not have the faintest idea what the form of the Sacrament was nor could he remember whether or not Thuc had laid hands on the head of the one consecrated. Fr. Sanborn asked him: “Did he (Thuc) place both hands on the head of Guerard des Laurieres?” Dr. Hiller responded: “I don't know what is prescribed. I think yes” (recorded interview, Dr. Kurt Hiller, February 10, 1988, Munich, Germany). When Dr. Heller was asked if Thuc had laid hands on the head of Fr. Des Laurieres, he refused to answer. He said that he could not be expected to remember such details. It was the opinion of Hiller and Heller that the consecration had been done correctly; but it is not the function of witnesses to give opinions. As Fr. Lydon says: “Witnesses report facts; they are not to give opinions or judgments on the meaning of what they saw or heard.”

The preceding article came off the internet.

In paragraph three Des Laurieres seems to be given credit for writing The Ottaviano Intervention. Let him be satisfied with having dreamed up his Cassiciacum theory—a truly

unique concept which rivals my own Duaedimideity. Credit for either is too much for anyone.

* * * * *

An accountant has decided to charge the usurpers with some of their heresies—to make them accountable for the damage they have wrought on the Catholic Church. He has swamped me and apparently others with pages of legal charges drawn up in the language of the courts. He appears to appreciate the current vacancy of the Holy See, and virtual impossibility of the validity of Holy Orders conferred by high-degree Freemasons.

Would that his reason encompassed the Feeneyite innovation. He seriously quoted an argument(?) by a religious illiterate too young ever to have seen the Catholic Church in action, to wit, that he has unearthed at Oxford a man who can furnish an unheard-of definition of *aut*. I have a bank of Latin lexicons, including Lewis & Short (2019 pp. of small print) and Leverett (1342 pp. of smaller print), none of which countenance translation of *aut* as anything but **either** or **or**, and objectively in contrast. Certainly no Council of the Catholic Church would use it in such a rare and unprecedented sense as conveying **and**, for which there are several common Latin equivalents.

Many of his arguments were refuted in the book segment I sent him (*The Enemy Is Still Here!*, pp. 129-174). For instance, “You challenge us to produce papal support for traditional doctrine. Not much has ever been defined until queried. No one condemns a heresy before it is proposed and gains adherents. We look in vain both for ancient condemnations of Father Feeney’s innovation and official definition of what has never been questioned.

Many catechumens were already baptized? Why, then, would the Roman Martyrology not recognize such facts? The very fact that this official book of the Church counts catechumens killed for the faith as automatically canonized should witness also to the general belief of the faithful of the time. But this man rejects an official book of the Church and cites in opposition **Butler’s Lives of the Saints**.

He then chided me for not replying to his questioning of differences in reporting the same facts in the Gospels. I am not sure I read them the first time. I have only so much time. But Sts. Mark and Luke were not present on some of these occasions, and would have relied on witnesses. Eye-witness testimony on the same events often varies, and no one thinks anything of it. One viewer notices this, another notices that. But this man creates difficulties like any old confirmed atheist who turns nits into fiery dragons. He also chides St. Thomas Aquinas, who obviously favored baptism of desire and blood, though as non-sacramental, for not believing in the Immaculate Conception, which was defined almost six centuries after he died. Then he says: “No Pope has issued a clear and direct Decree on the three baptisms.” So that makes me a heretic?

He had also sent me Peter Dimond’s *Outside the Catholic Church there is Absolutely no Salvation*, and asked why I was unable or unwilling to “critique” it. I had covered all such stupidity in the aforesaid forty-five pages from *The Enemy Is Still Here!* Time is short!

He had commented that it is regrettable that part of Anne Katherine Emmerich’s visions had not been condemned because she placed Protestants in Purgatory. It had not occurred to him that the fact that the Church approved the visions without making an exception for the possibility of Protestants in Purgatory is that such a possibility violates no Catholic doctrine. After all, she never said that their false religion had procured their salvation, which statement would certainly have prevented Church approval.

“Am I correct in believing that you ... went to visit Sister Lucy before she died?” he asks. That would be the best time, but no, I did not.

“Now after reading my 33 points disproving that Fatima is from God, do you still believe?”
When have I ever said whether I believed? To me no private revelation is an issue.

Next we draw his fire for providing venues for Mass “which is supposed to be said in private.”—
if we accept limitations from apostate Mass-haters. Priests were ordained chiefly to celebrate
Mass and provide the sacraments. All those properly ordained in the Church were sent, as
required by St. Paul. They are obliged to fulfill their purpose, and no one can retract their
mission, though a case
might be made for a genuine Catholic bishop over priests in his own diocese. A lack of bishops,
far from disabling, removes local restrictions on priests. No one can invade the nonexistent
jurisdiction of a heretic. No priest needs a heretic’s permission to operate.
After all this irrelevant nonsense, and additional uninformed defamation of a member of my
family, he asks me to sit on his 33-person “grand jury” to indict all the apostate usurpers.

* * * * *

There are, incidentally, a lot of kooks in this business. One sent me a postcard condemning a
family member for “selling out to the Jews,” and wished him well on the use of his ill-gotten
gains. He further alleged that a certain motion picture depicted the crucifying nails wrongly. I
suggested (phone) that he remember all Crucifixes we had ever seen. Most show the nails driven
through the Hands. Wrong! The Holy Shroud of Turin shows nail scars on the Wrists. *Didn’t I
believe in the Shroud of Turin?* The Shroud shows where the nails *came out!* Try to imagine a
cadaver with its arms wrapped at its sides and its palms out.

Does expert opinion matter? I have seen medical arguments that nails driven through hands
would not support the weight and would pull through the insufficient bone structure. But the
executioners were experts, too.

Medical reports indicate also that one of the thorns in the crown had been sufficient to end life,
and that in crucifixion death is caused by asphyxiation. The victim can no longer draw a breath.
Breaking legs, therefore, speeds the process.

Matthew 27:46-50. And about the ninth hour, Jesus cried with a *loud voice*, saying: And
Jesus again crying with a *loud voice*, yielded up the ghost. Miraculous all!

* * * * *

THE WAR IS NOW! No. 69, January 2007

The Tablet, weekly paper of the diocese of Brooklyn, New York, relates, in its December 2
issue, that words of the consecration in the *novus ordo missae* vernaculars will be changed to
agree with the Latin text. No longer will the president misquote Jesus Christ at the Last Supper.
But this, according to “Cardinal” Francis Arinze, prefect of the Congregation for Divine Worship
and the Sacraments, entails no change in the Catholic doctrine that Christ died for all. It merely
relates the ceremonial action, whatever it may be, to the Vulgate, in which Jesus Christ is quoted
in translation from that loose Aramaic in which, say anonymous “scholars,” many is inclusive
and may refer to all.

Arinze’s group, working with the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, had in 2005
consulted heads of bishops’ conferences around the world, asking their views on proper
translation of *pro multis*. 90% of the U.S. “bishops” responding to a survey felt that “for all”
[despite its inaccuracy] was the best translation. 6% thought “for the many” better. 4% preferred
“for many.” [So much for the superior education of the clergy!]

The two congregations, said Arinze, studied the result and reported to Ratzki, who overrode the

bishops and directed Arinze's "for many." Nevertheless, no return to truth in translation may precede the new translation of the "Roman Missal" expected in "several years," by which time a new "pope," unappreciative of the strategy, may well countermand this minor return to a semblance of orthodoxy.

Ratzi waves the Mass as Montini waved *Humanae vitae*. He pretends to believe that he can satisfy us by returning our Mass. But we want our whole Church back, including, if possible, a genuine pope—who will not participate in formal Moslem prayer.

Incidentally, why "for you?"—("pro vobis?") Should it not be included in "for all?"

* * * * *

The SSPX Consecrations A CANONICAL STUDY (published in July 1988)

By Rudolf Kaschewsky German Canonist and correspondent for Una Voce Deutschland

I. Consecration of a bishop has, in the hierarchy of the Sacrament of Orders, pride of place. A cardinal and the pope do not have a higher consecration. A bishop possesses: ... 1) power of consecration; power of jurisdiction, which he can exercise only if in charge of a diocese.

Episcopal power is of divine right, and endows a bishop with personal authority, and legal and constitutional status which the pope can neither suppress nor modify.

II. A bishop is not allowed to confer episcopal consecration without papal mandate (Can. 953, Code of Canon Law, 1917). Whoever acts contrarily incurs an excommunication *latae sententiae*—reserved to the Holy See (Can. 1382, CIC 1983). The excommunication *latae sententiae* takes effect by the very act itself; it does not need to be decreed. In this particular case, the 1917 Canon Law inflicted only a suspension (*Ipsa iure suspensi sunt, donec Sedes Apostolica eos dispensaverit*— They are suspended by the Law itself, until the Apostolic See dispenses them." (Can. 2370. CIC 1917.)

It is only since the Decree of the Holy Office of August 9, 1951, that the sanction of the excommunication *ipso facto* most specially reserved to the Holy See was introduced for illegal episcopal consecrations. This was due, without doubt, to the tragic turn of the Church in the People's Republic of China. This sanction was later confirmed after the actions of the sect of Palmar de Troya in Spain.

III. However, Canon Law is far from judging things only according to their exterior aspects. Not to take into account the particular circumstances and the subjective disposition of the persons in question would also be in contradiction with the Church's current notion of justice. [?] In the case of an episcopal consecration without papal mandate, the threatened sanction, according to the terms of Can. 1382, is very clearly an *ipso facto* sanction as stated above. Therefore, in this case one must apply the principle: "An *ipso facto* sanction does not apply if there exists an extenuating circumstance as laid down by law."

There is thus need to consider attentively the rules of Canons 1323 and 1324 of the CIC 1983, which correspond to Canons 2205 (N.2,3) of the CIC 1917. These canons deal with the case of an act to which a sanction is normally attached, but which was done only in order to avoid a grave inconvenience or to provide for a necessity. Canon 1323, N. 4 (CIC 1983): "No penalty is incurred by a person forced by a necessity to act against the law." [Why now? Why not 25 years earlier?] The former Code (Can. 2205, N.2) speaks in the same sense. (For the restrictions in both cases, see VII to IX here below.)

IV. What does the law mean by “grave inconvenience” and “necessity”?

Let us quote from the book on Canon Law written by E. Eichmann (Kl. Mörsdorf): “A grave inconvenience or necessity is a situation of constraint such that, without fault, the person in difficulty is physically or morally obliged to do something against the law in order to avert the danger. (*Necessitas non habet legem* —necessity has no law.) This may be a threat against his spiritual goods, his life, his freedom or other earthly goods.”

V. It is generally granted that due to the orientations taken after the Council, one finds within the Church a serious threat against the spiritual goods especially with regard to priestly formation, Faith, morals and religious worship.

The question is to know if and how one can combat this attack upon the spiritual goods. No one will contest that one way (if not the only way) of healing the evils which we suffer, resides in the raising of priestly vocations and the formation of good priests.

VI. Clearly there is a situation of grave inconvenience. Some candidates to the priesthood are correctly trained outside of official seminaries, who would almost certainly never be ordained. Here is certainly such a situation of necessity, from which any penalty is excluded. Only the consecration of a bishop who would ordain these priests can avert the above-mentioned danger. Otherwise not only the studies and the priestly formation of these candidates for the Holy Priesthood would be lost, but also the faithful who depend upon them would not benefit by these spiritual goods which they would be able to receive through them. Thus the faithful also find themselves in a situation of danger. [We had been in danger at least a quarter century. But if Lefebvre had acted sooner he would have had less chance of a virtual monopoly in the sacramental field.] Of course it would be exaggerating [!] to say that the spiritual goods necessary for the salvation of souls are not administered in any official post-conciliar church; but the disastrous present situation consists in Catholics often having to wonder whether the catechesis and religious services are still truly Catholic. Even moderate and objective observers acknowledge that at least in some cases the true intention of the priest, indispensable for the validity of the sacraments, is doubtful, or even clearly absent.

VII. First restriction of the principle applied above: in Can. 2205, N. 2 of the 1917 Code, the threat of sanction in such situations of emergency was lifted only when it was a law purely of ecclesiastical right and not of Divine Right. This restriction is not found in the new Code. [Of course not! *The new code is concerned with man's rights*, not God's.] Now since those [heretic usurpers] who would like to apply this sanction would most certainly use the new Code, such a restriction would not apply, even if the one performing these consecrations would feel bound by it. [Unless he belonged to the postconciliar “Church” he **would** have been bound by it.]

VIII. Another restriction: only situations of necessity of an accidental character excuse from the sanction. This means that the inconveniences which are naturally linked with the fulfillment of a certain law must be accepted and do not authorize one to break the law. However, this restriction does not apply in our case since it is precisely accidental, unusual and highly against the nature of things that respect for the law—that is, to abstain from the episcopal consecration without papal mandate—leads to the situation of peril. The fact that the salvation of souls is endangered by abstaining from such episcopal consecration does not constitute a situation of peril normally linked to obedience to the law, but is rather a characteristic [of many years' standing] of the present abnormal situation.

IX. Another restriction: an action incurring a punishment, but performed in order to avert a danger, is not exempted from sanction if it is intrinsically evil or brings prejudice to souls (Can.

1324, N.1.5). In the former Code, the limits of the dispensation from sanctions were still more restricted (Can. 2205, 2): any action leading to the contempt of Faith or of the hierarchy of the Church was also condemned. [Currently, actions of the hierarchy lead in generating contempt for the “Church.”] The question whether or not an episcopal consecration without papal mandate is an act intrinsically evil or leading to the prejudice of souls, without any doubt, goes beyond the framework of law of the Church, or at least cannot be decided by purely juridical considerations. But precisely here judgments differ: some say that it would cause an immense damage for souls because of the danger of schism; others speak of an action absolutely required [but so late!] for the salvation of souls.

X. However, we need not answer this question, since Canon 1324, N. 3, CIC 1983, simply says that in situations described in N. 1, there is no sanction for the person who does not follow the law. This means that [with support from a new code of heretical, contradictory laws] even if one would claim that an episcopal consecration without papal mandate would be in all cases an act by itself worthy of an automatic sanction, and bringing prejudice to souls, it would still remain free from an automatic sanction (*latae sententiae*) because of the emergency situation described above. Now exactly such a sanction is threatened in the case of a non-authorized episcopal consecration by Can. 1382, CIC 1983! It follows, on the basis of a situation of evident peril (Can. 1323 N. 4, Can. 1324, N. 1,5 and N. 3), that the threat of excommunication, threatened by Canon 1382 against the unauthorized consecrator, would not apply.

XI. Even if one were to call in question or actually deny altogether the existence of a situation of emergency, as we have described it, the following would still apply:

No one will deny that a bishop who, in the aforementioned situation, consecrates another one, would be at least subjectively of the opinion that he is in a situation of necessity such as we have described above. Thus one cannot speak of a premeditated violation of the law: for one who goes against the law but believing even wrongly that his action is legitimate, does not act in a premeditated way. [*He acts on the spur of the moment?*] The New Code is even clearer:

The person who thought, without fault on his part, that a circumstance foreseen in Canon 1323, N. 4,5,7, applied when he was breaking the law or an administrative order, does not incur any punishment.

The violator of the law is not exempt from all penalty, but the penalty laid down in the law or in the administrative order must be mitigated, or a penance must be substituted, if the offense was accomplished by someone believing through an error, even if culpable, that he was in a circumstance foreseen in Can. 1323, N. 4 and 5 (Can. 1324, N. 1.8).

Moreover, Canon 1324, N. 3, says: “In the circumstances explained in N. 1, the violator does not incur any *latae sententiae* (automatic) penalty.” Thus those who would suppose that the emergency exists only in the fantasy and the imagination of the Bishop concerned could hardly argue that this supposedly erroneous conception would be punishable. Even if someone were to put it to him that he was guilty for having arrived at such a mistaken notion of the existence of an emergency (not, in fact, existing), still:

The automatic excommunication could not follow as mentioned in Canon 1382 (it could not be automatic).

In any case, an eventual penalty which a judge might apply would have to be more clement than that foreseen in the law, so that an excommunication would be out of the question.

XII. Due to the existence of a real emergency, a bishop who would consecrate another one without a papal mandate, would not fall under the sanction prescribed for illegal consecration (Can. 1323, N. 4).

Even if the emergency did not objectively exist, the violator would remain exempt from any sanction since he would have subjectively and in a non-culpable way estimated that there was a real emergency (Can. 1324, N. 1.5).

One must also say that, even if there were an erroneous and punishable supposition of an emergency, still there would be no automatic sanction, much less an excommunication (Can. 1324, N. 1.8,3).

[Each and every argument based on the new heretical code of 1983 and its individual or compounded “laws” shares the invalidity of the code itself, which was “promulgated” by the incompetent authority of an antipope ineligible by reason of multiple public heresy. Therefore Kaschewsky’s following summation/conclusion is equally baseless, inconsequent, and invalid.]

XIII. Therefore, the widely spread opinion that the consecration of one or several bishops without papal mandate would cause an automatic excommunication and would lead to schism are false. Due to the very terms of the applicable law itself, an excommunication for the aforementioned case could be applied, neither automatically, nor by sentence of a judge.

FOOTNOTES ...

Note of the Editor: The decree of Cardinal Gantin of July 1, 1988, is that of a “sentence judge,” since there has been no hearing, and he is not in the Rota (the juridical congregation in Rome), but rather in the Congregation for Bishops. It is rather a “declaration” according to the very terms of the document. Thus all the arguments of this canonical study still remain valid: there is no real excommunication: the excommunication declared by Cardinal Gantin is null and void.

... (list of related articles and public statements) ...

A conference given by Archbishop Lefebvre on September 6, 1990 to his priests in Ecône that brilliantly summarizes the reasons for the Society’s position and the status of Catholic Tradition in light of the 1988 Consecrations

Then does this apply to Archbishop Thuc? What about Milingo? Will clemency be awarded to them, do you think? Let me answer by asking you a question: if Liberius, who was pope, unjustly condemned Athanasius for his defense of the faith against the onslaughts of Arianism, didn’t John Paul II behave in a similar fashion by condemning Archbishop Lefebvre for his defense of the faith [?] against the onslaughts of modernism?

My own answer would be that the Pontiff certainly acted improperly. The Archbishop was unjustly condemned because he sought to prevent the destruction of the ancient Mass and with it Catholic Tradition. [Nonsense!] But he acted nevertheless canonically in a state of necessity--a state that had been occasioned by the Pope's own persistent hostility toward Tradition. In other words, the Archbishop had every right not to submit to an improper papal command not to consecrate, given the stakes involved--the preservation of Catholic Tradition.

This should make clear that any comparison to Thuc or Milingo would be improper and superficial. Yet many who oppose the traditionalist movement customarily make this cheap shot-

-while ignoring the [1983 code] canonical evidence in support of the claims of the SSPX. The above analysis clearly lays it all out. There was no breach of [1983] Canon Law on the part of Archbishop Lefebvre since he acted out of necessity entirely within the parameters set by [1983] Canon Law.

That is to say, the Archbishop properly invoked canons 1323 and 1324. [The newchurch] Canon Law provided him with the means for such an exception to the papal precept on the grounds of necessity and the Archbishop had every right to avail himself of the law as he did. After all, not even a Pope may legitimately discount his own laws.

[If one must depend for support on the new, heretical code of canon laws, he hasn't much of an argument.]

[Another lame defense of Lefebvre is found at <http://angelqueen.org/forum/viewtopic.php?t=11608> It is more directed to what the individual Catholic can do in the present situation, while the incompetent argument we have presently quoted purports to demonstrate the legal basis of the consecrations and their inconsequent validity.]

* * * * *

SSPX spokesmen often derive “proofs” from incomplete quotations. Let me fill the gaps.

Canon 1323. No one is liable to a penalty who, when violating a law or precept:

- 1° has not completed the sixteenth year of age;
- 2° was, without fault, ignorant of violating the law or precept; inadvertence and error are equivalent to ignorance
- 3° acted under physical force, or under the impetus of a chance occurrence which the person could not foresee or if foreseen could not avoid;
- 4° acted under the compulsion of grave fear, even if only relative, or by reason of necessity or grave inconvenience, unless, however, the act is intrinsically evil or tends to be harmful to souls;
- 5° acted, within the limits of due moderation, in lawful self-defense or defense of another against an unjust aggressor;
- 6° lacked the use of reason, without prejudice to the provisions of Canon 1324, §1, n. 2 and 1325;
- 7° thought, through no personal fault, that some one of the circumstances existed which are mentioned in nn. 4 or 5.

Canon 1324 §1 The perpetrator of a violation is not exempted from penalty, but the penalty prescribed in the law or precept must be diminished, or a penance substituted in its place, if the offence was committed by:

- 1° one who had only an imperfect use of reason;
- 2° one who was lacking the use of reason because of culpable drunkenness or other mental disturbance of a similar kind;
- 3° one who acted in the heat of passion which, while serious, nevertheless did not precede or hinder all mental deliberation and consent of the will, provided that the passion itself had not been deliberately stimulated or nourished;
- 4° a minor who has completed the sixteenth year of age;
- 5° one who was compelled by grave fear, even if only relative, or by reason of necessity or grave inconvenience, if the act is intrinsically evil or tends to be harmful to souls;
- 6° one who acted in lawful self-defense or defense of another against an unjust aggressor, but did not observe due moderation;
- 7° one who acted against another person who was gravely and unjustly provocative;

8° one who erroneously, but culpably, thought that some one of the circumstances existed which are mentioned in Canon 1323, nn. 4 or 5;

9° one who through no personal fault was unaware that a penalty was attached to the law or precept;

10° one who acted without full imputability, provided it remained grave.

§2 A judge can do the same if there is any other circumstance present which would reduce the gravity of the offence.

§3 In the circumstances mentioned in §1, the offender is not bound by a *latae sententiae* penalty.

Canon 1325 Ignorance which is crass or supine or affected can never be taken into account when applying the provisions of Canon 1323 and 1324. Likewise, drunkenness or other mental disturbances cannot be taken into account if these have been deliberately sought so as to commit the offence or to excuse it; nor can passion which has been deliberately stimulated or nourished.

Canon 1382 A bishop who consecrates some one a bishop and the person who receives such a consecration from a bishop without a pontifical mandate incur an automatic (*latae sententiae*) excommunication reserved to the Apostolic See.

Canon 1383 A bishop who violates the prescription of canon 1015 and ordains a person who is not his subject without legitimate dimissorial letters is prohibited from conferring orders for one year. The person who received the order is *ipso facto* suspended from the order received.

Compare these 1983 “laws” with the 1917 law which they have “replaced”:

Canon 2205 §1 Physical force which takes away all power to act completely excludes crime.

§2 Also fear which is even relatively grave, necessity, and even grave inconvenience usually excuse entirely from crime, if there is question of merely ecclesiastical laws.

§3 But if the act done is intrinsically wrong, or tends toward contempt of the faith or of ecclesiastical authority, or toward harm to souls, the causes mentioned in §2 diminish but do not entirely remove imputability of the crime.

§4 The circumstance of legitimate defense against an unjust aggressor, if due moderation be observed, entirely excuses from crime; otherwise it merely diminishes imputability, and the same is to be said of provocation.

\$\$\$PX “Bishop” Williamson, in his letter (Sept. 13, 1992) thoroughly answered in my writings, used part of St. Thomas Aquinas (*Summa Theologica*, Supplement, Q 35, a. 5) to support the validity of Marcel Lefebvre’s “Orders.”

Archbishop Lefebvre, says Williamson, is supposed to have been an invalid priest and/or bishop because he was both ordained priest and consecrated bishop by Cardinal Lienart, ... a [30 □ devil-worshipping, God-hating, automatically excommunicated] Freemason, and who therefore cannot have had the sacramental intention necessary to perform validly the ordination or consecration of Marcel Lefebvre.

Michael Davies replies 1) it is not proved beyond doubt that Cardinal Lienart was a Freemason. [nor that he was not a Freemason.] 2) Even if he was a Mason, he did not necessarily have an invalid sacramental intention in confecting a sacrament. 3) Every time he externally used the proper sacramental rite in a normal way, he may and must be presumed [**nonsense!**] to have had internally the intention necessary for validity. 4) Even if the Cardinal both at the ordination in 1927 and at the consecration in 1947, secretly withheld the necessary sacramental intention, nevertheless Marcel Lefebvre became a valid bishop and priest by either or both of the two bishops co-consecrating him in 1947 with the Cardinal. [**Episcopal power depends on the priestly power, since no one can receive the episcopal power unless he have previously the priestly power.** (Aquinas, see below)]

Thus as far as intention goes, to receive validly the empowering character of Baptism or Holy Orders, I need only intend [if eligible] in undergoing the rite to receive the sacrament; to bestow validly the character I need only (as a qualified minister) intend in putting together the requisite words and acts to do what the Church does. This is because the sacraments' primary cause is God, and the human minister need only do the minimum necessary to make himself God's instrument.

Thus immorality of intention need not invalidate the sacrament. Thus an unbeliever can validly baptize, an apostate priest can validly say Mass, and a Freemason can validly ordain or consecrate. [Not parallels.] Hence even if Lienart was a Freemason, he need not have given invalid Holy Orders to Archbishop Lefebvre. [*Not possibly having had the proper intention to be consecrated in the first place, he could not confer Holy Orders on anyone.*]

Ah yes, thirdly, but even if Cardinal Lienart could have validly ordained and consecrated Marcel Lefebvre, still he will not in fact have validly done so, because although in 1927 and 1947 he went through all the correct external motions by saying the necessary words and performing the necessary acts, still, as a Mason who must wish to harm the Church, he will have invalidated the Holy Orders he bestowed by secretly holding back the necessary internal intention to do what the Church does.

Reply: ... any such withholding would indeed invalidate the sacrament. But since any such withholding can by its nature be known to God alone, then the Catholic Church teaches that whenever a sacramental minister correctly performs the externals, he can and must be presumed to have had the corresponding internal intention unless and until there is clear proof to the contrary.

Now in general nothing proves that all Masons believe that the best way to hurt the Church is by invalidating any Orders they bestow (for instance they may well believe they will hurt her more by gaining higher positions inside the Church by gaining all the Catholics' confidence by the most perfect performance of their sacramental functions); [Thanks for exposing this motive, evident in those 120-odd masons infesting the *curia* and upper echelons of the Church, and in particular

Cardinal Lienart who led the revolt of the modernists at the Second Vatican Council. But these motives are not mutually exclusive. What apostate mason would neglect either?] and in particular, it is certain that Cardinal Lienart in 1927 and 1947 correctly used the proper external rite. Therefore the burden of proof is on the anti-Lefebvrists to prove that this Cardinal on these occasions withheld the necessary intention. What evidence do they have? None. They cannot even prove he was a Mason, ... [*Lefebvre himself admitted it publicly.*]

But again, fourthly, let us assume that Lienart was a Mason and ... that he deliberately invalidated the Orders conferred on Marcel Lefebvre. ... as Michael Davies ... argues, Marcel Lefebvre would still have become bishop and priest in 1947 at the hands of either or both of the two bishops co-consecrating him then with Cardinal Lienart: [**Episcopal power depends on the priestly power, since no one can receive the episcopal power unless he have previously the priestly power.** (Aquinas) See below.] he would have become bishop, because ... one alone needs to have had the correct intention ... he would have become a priest because as the greater contains the lesser, so bishopric contains priesthood. For to receive higher Orders without first receiving the preceding lower Orders is in the Catholic Church today unlawful, but as Michael Davies learnedly [*but erroneously*] argues, the position of some theologians [*including St. Thomas Aquinas* – see below.] and canonists that it is also invalid is having to be abandoned. For instance, St. Cyprian was made a bishop without first being made a priest.

[**The Catholic Encyclopedia**, 1913, Vol IV, pp 582 sqq. lists several Sts. Cyprian. A Bishop of Toulon (died 3 Oct. 546) “was the favourite pupil of St. Caesarius of Arles, by whom he was

trained, and who, in 506, ordained him to the diaconate, and, in 516, consecrated him Bishop of Toulon.” In the ten years between, many bishops were available to ordain him to the priesthood. Another was martyred at Nicomedia 26 Sept. 304 in Diocletian’s persecution. “He became in succession deacon, priest, and finally bishop.”

The first “was certainly only a recent convert when he became Bishop of Carthage c. 248 or the beginning of 249, but **he passed through all the grades of the ministry.**” In Dom Gueranger’s **The Liturgical Year**, Vol XIV, p 227: “Cyprian was a native of Africa, and at first taught rhetoric there with great applause. The priest, Caecilius ... having persuaded him to become a Christian, he thereupon distributed all his goods among the poor. Not long afterwards, **having been made priest**, he was chosen bishop of Carthage.”]

If there are always three bishops consecrating a new bishop, could the intentions of the two assistant bishops make up for a defective intention of the main consecrating bishop?

Even if everything we have said above is false, and Cardinal Liénart did not validly ordain Archbishop Lefebvre as a priest, Archbishop Lefebvre’s consecration as a bishop was still certainly valid. This is because the Church always requires three bishops to co-consecrate a new bishop, just in case one of them has a defective intention, or were invalidly consecrated themselves.

Thus, when Archbishop Lefebvre was consecrated a bishop by Cardinal Liénart, two other bishops co-consecrated with him. There is no evidence that either of these co-consecrators (Bishop Alfred Ancel of Lyon, France and Bishop Jean-Baptiste Fauret of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost) were freemasons. Certainly, their names do not appear on the "list" of freemasons in the Church, where we find Cardinal Liénart’s name. And it doesn't matter whether Archbishop Lefebvre's priestly ordination was valid, because the validity of an ordination does not depend on receiving a lower order. As St. Thomas Aquinas says: “If one receives a subsequent order, without receiving a preceding order, he is not reordained, but he receives what is lacking... Therefore the preceding order is not necessary for the following.” (S.T. Suppl. 35.5) [As shown below, St. Thomas here treats of minor orders.] Therefore, whether or not Archbishop Lefebvre was a validly ordained priest, he was certainly a validly consecrated bishop.

Summa Theologica, Suppl. q. 35 a. 5

Whether the character of one Order necessarily presupposes the character of another Order?

... On the contrary, If anything necessary for a sacrament be omitted in that sacrament, the sacrament must be repeated. But if one receive a subsequent Order, without receiving a preceding Order, he is not reordained, but he receives what was lacking, according to the canonical statutes (*cap. Tuae litterae, De clerico per salt. prom.*). Therefore the preceding Order is not necessary for the following.

I answer that, **It is not necessary for the higher Orders that one should have received the minor Orders**, because their respective powers are distinct, and one, considered in its essentials, does not require another in the same subject. Hence even in the early Church **some were ordained priests without having previously received the lower Orders** and yet they could do all that the lower Orders could, because the lower power is comprised in the higher, even as sense in understanding, and dukedom in kingdom. Afterwards, however, it was decided by the legislation of the Church that no one should present himself to the higher orders who had not previously humbled himself in the lower offices. And hence it is that according to the Canons (*cap. Tuae litterae, De clerico per salt. prom.*) those who are ordained without receiving a preceding Order are not reordained, but receive what was lacking to them of the preceding Order.

[Williamson never mentioned *q. 40 a. 5 in the same book*. In discussing priests and bishops, he stops at acolytes!]

Whether the episcopate is an Order?

Objection 1. It would seem that the episcopate is an Order. First of all, because Dionysius (Eccles. Hier. v) assigns these three orders to the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the bishop, the priest, and the minister. In the text also (Sent. iv, D, 24) it is stated that the episcopal Order is fourfold.

Objection 2. Further, Order is nothing else but a degree of power in the dispensing of spiritual things. Now bishops can dispense certain sacraments which priests cannot dispense, namely Confirmation and Order. Therefore the episcopate is an Order.

Objection 3. Further, in the Church there is no spiritual power other than of Order or jurisdiction. But things pertaining to the episcopal power are not matters of jurisdiction, else they might be committed to one who is not a bishop, which is false. Therefore they belong to the power of Order. Therefore the bishop has an Order which a simple priest has not; and thus the episcopate is an Order.

On the contrary, One Order does not depend on a preceding order as regards the validity of the sacrament. But the **episcopal power depends on the priestly power, since no one can receive the episcopal power unless he have previously the priestly power**. Therefore the episcopate is not an Order.

Further, the greater Orders are not conferred except on Saturdays. [* The four Ember Saturdays] But the episcopal power is bestowed on Sundays†. Therefore it is not an Order.

I answer that, Order may be understood in two ways. In one way as a sacrament, and thus, as already stated (q. 37, AA. 2,4), every Order is directed to the sacrament of the Eucharist. Wherefore since the bishop has not a higher power than the priest, in this respect the episcopate is not an Order. In another way Order may be considered as an office in relation to certain sacred actions: and thus since in hierarchical actions a bishop has in relation to the mystical body a higher power than the priest, the episcopate is an Order. It is in this sense that the authorities quoted speak.

Hence the Reply to the First Objection is clear.

Reply to Objection 2. Order considered as a sacrament which imprints a character is specially directed to the sacrament of the Eucharist, in which Christ Himself is contained, because by a character we are made like to Christ Himself [Cf. P. III, Q 63, A, 3.]. Hence although at his promotion a bishop receives a spiritual power in respect of certain sacraments, this power nevertheless has not the nature of a character. For this reason the episcopate is not an Order, in the sense in which an Order is a sacrament.

Reply to Objection 3. The episcopal power is one not only of jurisdiction but also of Order, as stated above, taking Order in the sense in which it is generally understood.

[Williamson quotes or hides words of identical authority.]

We have recently been apprised of the following law promulgated by Pope St. Pius V.

Against Clerics whomsoever, whether secular or regular, guilty of abominable crime.
For perpetual remembrance of the matter.

That fearful crime, by which the polluted joined (papal) states have been consumed by the terrible judgment of God, attaches to Us bitterest sorrow, and gravely violently stirs our mind, that toward restraining it, as much as possible, we concentrate our efforts.

It was properly noted by the Lateran Council, that whatsoever Cleric will have been discovered to suffer from that incontinence which is against nature, on account of which the wrath of God falls upon the sons of unbelief (cf. Vulg. Eph. 5, 6), is to be ejected from the ranks of the clergy and be reduced to do penance in a monastery.

But lest the contagion of such a scourge, from the hope of impunity which is the greatest lure of sinning, more confidently grows in power, We determine that clerics guilty of this execrable crime are to be quite gravely punished, so that whoever does not abhor the ruination of the soul, the avenging secular sword of civil laws will certainly deter.

And thus because We have made a decree in this matter at the beginning of Our Pontificate, now in a fuller and stronger way intending it to be followed strictly, each and all priests, whoever they are, other secular clerics, and regular clerics of any grade and dignity, busy at such a monstrosity, We deprive of every clerical privilege, of every office, dignity, and ecclesiastical benefice by the authority of the present legal instrument. So it is enacted that once they are degraded by the Ecclesiastical Judge, they be handed over immediately to the secular arm, which will exact upon them the same penalty, which is ascertained to have been constituted by legitimate sanctions against laymen who have slid down into this ruin.

Nothing to the contrary withstanding, etc.

Given at Rome at St. Peter's, 30 August in the Year of the Lord's Incarnation 1568 during the third year of Our Pontificate.

* * * * *

As Hugo Maria Kellner demonstrated, Canon 968 (1917 Code) falsified Church doctrine by listing apostasy and excommunication as “irregularities”—thus preserving non-existent Catholic rights of ex-Catholics.

The 1917 Code was a codification of the many overlapping sources of the law, not intended as a correction. It removed laws for which no purpose remained, but freemasonry remains a major foe, entitled to no benefit from our laws. Only treachery could have introduced this “loophole.”

Certain laws enacted against enemies of the Church by the Third National Council of Toledo (589) were ignored in the 1917 codification. Obviously these laws would have greatly impeded the modernist usurpation of the highest offices in the Church. So we look to the background of those who guided and approved the 1917 codification. We find that though the codification was ordered under the authority of Pope St. Pius X, it was committed to known Freemasons Gasparri and Rampolla (cf. *The Undermining of the Catholic Church*, Mary Martinez), and approved by their crony, Benedict XV after the opportune death of St. Pius X. We are almost forced to the conclusions that (1) Randy Engels could have gone further back in her research for her book, **The Rite of Sodomy**, and (2) Gasparri, Rampolla, and Benedict XV were protecting themselves. It is extremely difficult to construe their omission of vital legal protection of the Church as mere coincidence.

* * * * *

Saturday January 6, 2007 5:01 PM

By FRANCES D'EMILIO Associated Press Writer

VATICAN CITY (AP) - Religious leaders of all faiths must play a role in ensuring that the spiritual and cultural aspects of life are not forgotten as mankind tackles the challenges of globalization, Pope Benedict XVI said Saturday.

In his homily during Mass in St. Peter's Basilica, the pope said recent decades have seen a “challenge to global civilization, where the center can no longer be Europe and not even that which we call the West or the North of the world.” [When civilization's mother abdicates, what can be expected of the orphan?]

“The need emerged to elaborate a new world political and economic order, but at the same time and above all, a spiritual and cultural one - that is, renewed humanism,” he said. [Spiritual humanism? Obviously, the remedy is return of the effectiveness of the mother.]

“We find ourselves smack in the middle of this phase of human history, that has been for some time dubbed ‘globalization.’” [How about “dehumanization?”]

The pope said that while politicians, scientists and researchers play important roles in the modern world, “today, more than ever, it is necessary to place at their side the leaders of the great non-Christian religious traditions” as well as Christian leaders. [Current “Christian” leadership is a contradiction in terms, so we call to our aid the misguided leaders of the false non-Christian anti-religious traditions!]

Benedict appeared to be building on a theme often stressed by his predecessor, John Paul II, who worried [or bragged?] that modernization was coming at the cost of spirituality.

* * * * *

THE WAR IS NOW! No. 71, July 2007

Were I to research improbable causes for the incredible collapse of stability in all aspects of our Church, after a dozen years devoted to a preposterous myth without shadow of supportive evidence, and indeed in possession of disproof, I would publish my report to this effect. If I hid this disproof another five years till some one else discovered it, I would slink out of sight until I could dream up some way to offset the time loss I had inflicted on the entire Church. I would not try to shift blame onto those who had found me out. I will accept blame for failing sooner to advert to the problem.

Were I a priest celebrating Mass for an organization, and the organization requested proof of valid ordination, I would, as quietly as possible, furnish the proof. I would not canvass for votes among the congregation (not party to the request) with pictures of parts of my ordination ceremony. For such action would arouse suspicion that I could furnish no proof.

The subjects triggered their own downfalls. They reacted so oddly that we investigated. Neither passed muster. Neither will go quietly. Both continue to prefer personal whitewash and gain to the welfare of the Church and its members.

The phony priest, we heard, was already being investigated. So we instituted another inquiry. We found ourselves sixth in line, and all results agreed. The clincher was a copy of the twelve-page vernacular manual for use of attendees at his *novus ordo* “ordination” ritual. Page 1 listed the “deacons” to be “ordained.” Skeletonized though the manual was, it listed the following differences from the old rite:

The consent of the people, the litany of the saints, (cut from 113 to 53 invocations), offertory procession, presentation of the gifts (The people now present to the Bishop the gifts to be used for the Mass. The Bishop presents the chalice and paten to each new “priest” saying: Accept the gifts from the people to be offered to God. Be conscious of what you are doing, be as holy as the actions you perform, and model your life after the mystery of the Lord’s cross.)

[This last replaces the tradition of the instruments (which, till Pius XII’s *Sacramentum Ordinis*, was held to be the form of priestly ordination): Receive the power to offer sacrifice to God and to celebrate Mass for the living as well as for the dead.]

The (1969 *novus ordo*) liturgy then continued uninterrupted to its bitter end, whereas the traditional ordination intrudes again at length after communion.

Once a con-man always a con-man.

Better than working for a living! Especially if one lacks all qualification for gainful employment. Suppose, for instance, that one has been “educated” for post-sacramental presidency in the postconciliar “Church,” and the local heretics eject one (for whatever offense) from his non-functional but salaried benefice. “To dig I am not able:” (at least not really

inclined) “To beg I am ashamed.” (Luke 16:3) He has for years been paid for nothing; who can beat that? Is he not entitled to continued support of the deluded faithful?

He drums up support of the deluded unfaithful of a schismatic parish in the next state. He is again ejected for willful discharge of a firearm within rectory limits. He could well have faced serious consequences had his aim been better.

He discovers the shortage of priests who will celebrate the traditional Catholic Mass, and, despite his inability, pretends to fill the vacuum. Being indispensable, he makes exorbitant demands on his flock. Sheep, after all, exist to be shorn. But a genuine shepherd will feed his flock. This con-man pushes until forbidden the premises under threat of prosecution.

But he had found other woollier sheep, to whom he presented himself as a traditionally ordained Catholic priest, knowing well that his support depended entirely upon that qualification. He knew that by his misrepresentation he subjected his flock to idolatry ↓ violation of the First Commandment of the Decalogue. (When an invalidly ordained “priest” pretends to celebrate Mass he provides false worship of bread and wine ↓ idolatry if anyone assisting believes it a true Mass). Even had his flock been mistaken in belief of this fact, he acted fraudulently and unconscionably. He had no goal but financial. His later valid ordination, if real, would saddle us with the same criminal.

His flock inescapably arrived at realization that truth is not in him. But that he would pretend to priesthood surpassed belief, until he himself clearly implied that he had done so. Further investigation confirmed the suspicion that he had himself aroused. If further evidence had been required, he furnished it himself by his reaction to requests for proof of traditional ordination. If proof had existed, he would have presented it, if for naught else but continued financial support. He, however, slandered his benefactors.

Moreover he continues his deceit; he now services a group in southern Indiana, left priestless by the death of Fr. James Wathen (*The Great Sacrilege*). They have been warned, but they choose to listen to the romantic fantasies of “Father” Leonard Joseph Bealko, who has been driven to travel that far from Indiana, Pennsylvania, because of the increasing number of Pennsylvanians who have evaluated his con-games.

This brief mention is not to be mistaken for defamation, slander, or calumny, but merely as recognition of reality, to protect other sheep from inexorable shearing. For this predator will as surely be ejected from his latest flock as he has been by all his past victims, and he will then inevitably try to con more of us. It beats working. Wolves eat regularly. When do they work?

Ratzinger’s opposition to traditional worship confirmed

The Italian daily *Il Giornale* has confirmed a stunning revelation that when an “indult” was first being discussed in 1982, Ratzinger, who was then *New Vatican*’s Prefect of the Doctrine of the Faith, presided over a meeting on November 16, 1982, which proposed that an “indult” be given not for the “Mass of 1962,” but for the invalid “Mass of 1967.” The Mass of 1967 already included three waves of changes to the Mass, issued as Instructions by Hannibal Bugnini’s Commission after Vatican II (1963-1967) and before the final imposition of the *Novus Ordo* service in 1969.

The “Mass of 1967” includes the Bidding Prayers imported from Protestant services (“For all gays and lesbians, may Catholics embrace their sexuality and diversity: Lord, hear our prayer”), the removal of the Prayers at the Foot of the Altar and of the Last Gospel, the abolition of the traditional liturgical vestments, and the suppression of genuflections, among other Vatican II “reforms.” Most notably, however, the “Mass of 1967” included the infamous corruption of the Canon and its Consecration, and the addition of Hannibal Bugnini’s three fabricated new “Eucharistic prayers.”

This very “Mass of 1967” spurred P.H. Omlor to write his blockbuster 1968 book, **Questioning the Validity of the New, All-English Canon**, which was the first work to throw down the gauntlet publicly to Newchurch and to call its “Mass” an invalid contravention of Roman Catholic sacramental theology.

The recommendations of the Secret Ratzinger Commission have remained unpublished until now, when *Il Giornale* secured the confidential minutes of the meeting. These minutes record that Ratzinger was joined at the meeting by Newcardinals Sebastiano Baggio, the Prefect of Bishops; William Baum, the Prefect of Catholic Education; Agostino Casaroli, the Secretary of State and most important person after the pope; Silvio Oddi, the Prefect of Clergy; and Archbishop Giuseppe Casoria, the Prefect of the Sacraments and Divine Worship.

The Secret Ratzinger Commission, appointed by JP II, recommended that “the Roman Missal in the form in which it remained in use up to 1969 [when the *Novus Ordo* service was imposed] ... should be admitted by the Holy See for all Masses [sic] celebrated in the Latin language.” There were two provisos attached to this recommendation:

1. any “indult” for the “Mass of 1967” should require that those attending it should pledge “full acceptance of the norms issued after Vatican II” and should affirm that these norms were not “heretical or invalid.”
2. all “Indult” Masses in parish churches on Sundays and Feastdays must use the *Novus Ordo* Calendar.

Even more shocking was the Secret Ratzinger Commission's recommendation that in future “a synthesis of both Missals” [the traditional Missal and the *Novus Ordo* missal] be made. In other words, the traditional Missal, or at least the Missal of 1962, should eventually be merged into the *Novus Ordo* service of 1969, fabricated by Hannibal Bugnini and his Committee of Six Protestants.

As it happened, the recommendations of the Secret Ratzinger Commission, which the minutes show were adopted unanimously by all members present, were not all included when JP II published the first “indult” for the “Mass of 1962,” in the Apostolic Letter of October 3, 1984, or the second “indult,” in the Apostolic Letter *Ecclesia Dei* of July 2, 1988. It is obvious that if any imaginary new “indult” is forthcoming from Benedict-Ratzinger, it is not because he is a “traditionalist,” but merely because he sees this as a transitional phase carrying out the Modernistic prescriptions of Vatican II. — TRADITIO Network

* * * * *

Montini to the Sisters, Milan, 2/11/61: ‘There is more to be asked of you. You are capable of doing more. I want you closer. I will break up your ranks. I will separate you into little groups. I will scatter you among the Christian people, who have such need of seeing consecrated virgins in their midst. I will place you before the eyes of society, especially its youth, who have no other example of a life of virtue and of complete offering. I will put you close to my parishes. I will call you closer to my altars, I will involve you in all my activity for the salvation and sanctification of the world.’ This is the modern vocation of the Sister—to become a collaborator in the pastoral action of the Church. ...

* * * * *

Genes

A. Dean Byrd, Ph.D, MBA, MPH concurs with Dr. Francis S. Collins, major DNA researcher. “There is an inescapable component of heritability to many human behavioral traits; for virtually none of them, is heredity ever close to predictive.”

Dr. Collins’ referenced research estimated percentages of certain traits that can be ascribed to heredity: General Cognitive Ability (50%), Extroversion (54%), Agreeableness (42%), Conscientiousness (49%), Neuroticism (48%), Openness (57%), Aggression (38%), and Traditionalism (54%)—based upon unbiased, careful analyses of studies conducted with identical twins. These lead to the conclusion that heredity is important in many of these personality traits. Importantly, heritability is not to be confused as inevitability.

Environment can influence gene expression, and free will determines the response to

predispositions.

Dr. Collins: “Evidence from twin studies does in fact support the conclusion that heritable factors play a role in male homosexuality. However, the likelihood that the identical twin of a homosexual male will also be gay is about 20% (compared with 2-4 percent of males in the general population), indicating that sexual orientation is genetically influenced but not hardwired by DNA, and that whatever genes are involved represent predispositions, not predeterminations.”

Dr. Collins noted that environment--particularly childhood experiences--as well as the role of free will and choice affect us all in profound ways. As researchers discover increasing levels of molecular detail about inherited factors that underlie our personalities, it's critical that such data be used to illuminate the issues, not provide support to ideologues.

Citing such dangers, Dr. Collins referred to the book written by activist Dean Hamer, who declared the discovery of the “God gene” (this same author also is associated with “discovering the gay gene”). The “evidence” in Hamer's book “grabbed headlines,” but was “wildly overstated.”

A reviewer in Scientific American suggested that Hamer's book on the “God gene” should have been titled “A Gene That Accounts for Less than One Percent of the Variance Found in Scores on Psychological Questionnaires Designed to Measure a Factor Called Self-Transcendence, Which Can Signify Everything from Belonging to the Green Party to Believing in ESP, According to One Unpublished, Unreplicated Study.”

Much research in areas such as homosexuality has been misrepresented; not only in the media, but also by the scientists themselves through a tendency to overestimate the quantitative contribution of their findings.

Dr. Collins concluded, “We have all been dealt a particular set of cards, and the cards will eventually be revealed. But how we play the hand is up to us.”

* * * * *

The Catholic Gene

So far as we can determine, most Catholics originate from Catholic parents, most of whom were born to Catholic parents. Since infinite regression seems absurd, we look for a period before which there were no Catholics. Sure enough, we find none before Jesus Christ, from Whose birth we date our calendar. Do genes develop through the ages? Can they exist dormant, through God's Providence, and kick in where and when required?

Would this possibility, then, cover the queer gene? Was it required for the Sodomites in the time of Abraham? Is the homosexual gene older than the Catholic gene? Have the gays prior rights over Catholics? Even perhaps over the Founder of our religion? Or had He inherited the “God gene” from Adam? Presumably it preceded (and followed) Him in the Roman emperors. Did not Vespaian in his death throes say: “I think I am becoming a god?” Of course he had the stick by the wrong end; he became a god upon accessing the imperial throne, not upon relinquishing it. But the history of the Roman emperors would seem to indicate that their gene could be found anywhere.

One would like to think that Dr. Collins' “certain traits”—barring Neuroticism—were found among the genes of Catholics. Aggression can often be detected in missionaries. Traditionalism is indispensable. But we find these inculcated by Jesus Christ Himself in His last words to His Apostles:

“Go ye into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature.” (Mark xvi:15)

To the moron! To the mule! To the fanatic! To the cannibal! Even to the sodomite! God is their Judge. We are not to say: “What a bunch of savages!”

Nor are we to dialogue, discuss, compromise. Our mandate is to *teach!* We are missionaries *by definition*. We cannot care how much or little they agree with us on essentials. In one sense, the more they agree, the less likely they are to join us in the fullness of revealed doctrine and

morals. They may think they have enough.

Nor let us discount self-interest. The greed of Viking pirates became respectable in their Norman descendants, who stole the English crown and used it to enrich themselves at the expense of the French, Welsh, Scots, and Irish, before their major insurrection against the Church. Had Henry VII not been too greedy to return Catherine of Aragon's dowry when his first son died, this insurrection need never have happened, though possibly the prosperity of the monasteries might have drawn Henry VIII's attention anyway. Either way it would have led to the situation in which the religion in which every Englishman had been reared for nine centuries became High Treason!

And now we have the hierarchy, especially the Roman.

But the eternal Catholic gene appears to have been acquired, as befits the flock, from the sheep, who seem not to realize how radically they have been shorn.

What has happened to the Crusader?

* * * * *

Il Santo by Antonio Fogazzaro, published in English in the early 1900's after its placement on the Roman Index of Forbidden Books, as fine a manual of Modernism as could be desired, outlined the whole plot to make over the Catholic Church from inside.

Page 43: "There are many Catholics ... who, with us, desire certain reforms in the Church. We wish them to be brought about without rebellion, to be the work of the legitimate authorities. We desire reforms in religious instruction, in the ceremonies, in the discipline of the clergy, reforms even in the highest sphere of ecclesiastical government. To obtain these ends it is necessary to create a current of opinion strong enough to induce the legitimate authorities to act in conformity with our views, be it twenty, thirty, or even fifty years hence."

Page 185: "The Catholic Church, calling herself the fountain of truth, today opposes the search after truth when her foundations, the sacred books, the formulae of her dogmas, her alleged infallibility, become objects of research. ... this signifies that she no longer has faith in herself. The Catholic Church, which proclaims herself the channel of life, today fetters and stifles all that is youthful within her, today seeks to prop up all that is tottering and aged within her."

Page 188: "I see, in the future, Catholic laymen striving zealously for Christ and for truth, and finding a means of instituting unions different from those of the present. They will one day take arms as knights of the Holy Spirit, banding together for the united defence of God and of Christian morality, in the scientific, artistic, civil and social fields; for the united defence of legitimate liberty in the religious field. They will be under certain special obligations, not however of community living, or of celibacy, incorporating the office of the Catholic clergy, to which they will not belong as an Order, but only in their private capacity, in the individual practice of Catholicism. Pray that God's will may be made manifest concerning this work in the souls of those who contemplate it. Pray that these souls may willingly strip themselves of all pride in having conceived this work, and of all hope of witnessing its completion, should God manifest disapproval of it. If God manifest His approval of it, then pray that men may be taught to organize its every detail to His greater glory, and to the greater glory of the Church."

Page 213: "... although God is infinite and unchangeable, man's conception of Him becomes ever greater from century to century," [for each century's intelligence increases by evolution] "and the same may be said of all Divine Truth."

Page 217: "All ... who today oppose progressive Catholicism, would, in all good faith, have caused Christ to be crucified in the name of Moses. They are worshippers of the past; they wish everything to remain immovable in the Church, ... the spirit of immovability, by straining to preserve what is impossible to preserve, exposes us to the derision of unbelievers." [Oh, horror!]

The mania for change, which has eliminated what had been preserved for nineteen centuries, has exposed the *novus ordo* Church to the derision of logicians, historians, and Catholics.

Our predecessor John Paul II having already considered the insistent petitions of the faithful, having listened to the views of the Cardinal Fathers of the Consistory of 22 March 2006, having reflected deeply upon all aspects of the question, invoked the Holy Spirit and trusting in the help of God, with these Apostolic Letters We establish the following:

Art. 1 The Roman Missal promulgated by Paul VI is the ordinary expression of the Lex orandi (Law of Prayer) of the Catholic Church of the Latin Rite. Nonetheless, the Roman Missal promulgated by St. Pius V [last mention!] and reissued [with unwarranted variations] by Bl. John XXIII is to be considered as an extraordinary expression of that same Lex orandi, and must be given due honour for its venerable and ancient [1962] usage. These two expressions of the Church's Lex orandi will in no way lead to a division in the Church's Lex credendi (Law of Belief). They are, in fact two usages of the one Roman rite. [Is it not exhilarating, or at least hilarious, to be conned again by a claimant of the sedis vacantis?] It is, therefore, permissible to celebrate the Sacrifice of the Mass following the typical edition of the Roman Missal promulgated by Bl. John XXIII in 1962 and never abrogated, as an extraordinary form of the Liturgy of the Church. The conditions for the use of this Missal as laid down by earlier documents *Quattuor abhinc annis* and *Ecclesia Dei*, are substituted as follows:

Art. 2 In Masses celebrated without the people [a distinction never made before Vatican II], each Catholic priest of the Latin rite, whether secular or regular, may use the Roman Missal published by Bl. Pope John XXIII in 1962, or the Roman Missal promulgated by Pope Paul VI in 1970 [Easter 1969], and may do so on any day with the exception of the Easter Triduum.

For such celebrations, with either one Missal or the other, the priest has no need for permission from the Apostolic See or from his Ordinary.

Art. 3 Communities of Institutes or consecrated life and of Societies of apostolic life, of either pontifical or diocesan right, wishing to celebrate Mass in accordance with the edition of the Roman Missal promulgated in 1962, for conventual or "community" celebration in their oratories, may do so. If an individual community or an entire Institute or Society wishes to undertake such celebrations often, habitually, or permanently, the decision must be taken by the Superior Major, in accordance with the law and following their own specific decrees and statutes.

Art. 4 Celebrations of Mass as mentioned above in art. 2 may — observing all the norms of law — also be attended by faithful who, of their own free will, ask to be admitted.

Art. 5 (1) In parishes, where there is a stable group of faithful who adhere to the earlier liturgical tradition [and have probably quit attending the idolatry years ago] the pastor should willingly accept their requests to celebrate the Mass according to rite of the Roman Missal published in 1962, and ensure that the welfare of these faithful harmonises with the ordinary pastoral care of the parish, under the guidance of the bishop in accordance with canon 392, avoiding discord and favouring the unity of the whole Church. [Canon 392 (1983 code) alerts "bishops" to innovative abuses, such as the 1969 novus ordo missae which contributed so heavily toward disunity.]

(2) Celebration in accordance with the Missal of Bl. John XXIII may take place on working days; while on Sundays and feast days one such celebration may also be held.

(3) For faithful and priests who request it, the pastor should also allow celebrations in this extraordinary form for special circumstances such as marriages, funerals or occasional celebrations, e.g. pilgrimages.

(4) Priests who use the Missal of Bl. John XXIII must be qualified [What's the standard?] to do so and not juridically impeded.

(5) In churches that are not parish or conventual churches, it is the duty of the Rector of the church to grant [or refuse?] the above permission.

Art. 6 In Masses celebrated in the presence of the people in accordance with the Missal of Bl. John XXIII, the readings may be given in the vernacular, using editions recognized by the

Apostolic See [as opposed to proper translations].

Art. 7 If a group of lay faithful, as mentioned in art. 5 (1), has not obtained satisfaction to their requests from the pastor, they should inform the diocesan bishop. The bishop is strongly requested [but not forced] to satisfy their wishes. If he cannot arrange for such celebration to take place, the matter should be referred to the Pontifical Commission “Ecclesia Dei” [which has performed so speedily and well over the years].

Art 8. A bishop who, desirous of satisfying such requests, but who for various reasons is unable to do so, may refer the problem to the Commission “Ecclesia Dei” to obtain counsel and assistance.

Art. 9 1 The pastor, having attentively examined all aspects, may also grant permission to use the earlier ritual for the administration of the Sacraments of Baptism, marriage, Penance, and the Anointing of the Sick, if the good of souls would seem to require it. [He would not seem required to use the earlier ritual himself.]

2 Ordinaries are given the right to celebrate the Sacrament of Confirmation [No mention of Holy Orders!] using the earlier Roman Pontifical, if the good of souls would seem to require it. [Where are these earlier Pontificals and Rituals? Thrown out with the Altar Missals.]

3 Clerics ordained “in sacris constitutis” may use the Roman Breviary promulgated by Bl. John XXIII in 1962.

Art. 10 The Ordinary of a particular place, if he feels it appropriate, may erect a personal parish in accordance with can.518 for celebrations following the ancient [1962!] form of the Roman rite, or appoint a chaplain, while observing all the norms of law.

Art. 11 The Pontifical Commission “Ecclesia Dei” erected by John Paul II in 1988, continues to exercise its function [which has done what for the traditional Mass?]. Said Commission will have the form, duties and norms that the Roman Pontiff wishes to assign it.

Art. 12 This Commission, apart from the powers it enjoys, will exercise the authority of the Holy See, supervising the observance and application of these dispositions.

We order that everything We have established with these Apostolic Letters issued as Motu Proprio be considered as “established and decreed”, and to be observed from 14 September of this year, Feast of the Exaltation of the Cross, whatever there may be to the contrary.

From Rome, at St. Peter’s, 7 July 2007, third year of Our Pontificate.

My dear Brother Bishops,

With great trust and hope, I am consigning to you as Pastors the text of a new Apostolic Letter “Motu Proprio data” on the use of the Roman liturgy prior to the reform of 1970. [1969, dammit!] The document is the fruit of much reflection, numerous consultations and prayer.

News reports and judgments made without sufficient information have created no little confusion. There have been very divergent reactions ranging from joyful acceptance to harsh opposition, about a plan whose contents were in reality unknown [but somewhat suspected].

This document was most directly opposed on account of two fears, which I would like to address somewhat more closely in this letter.

In the first place, there is the fear that the document detracts from the [non-existent] authority of the Second Vatican Council, one of whose essential decisions —the liturgical reform — is being called into question [by any Catholic who has ever read it]. This fear is unfounded. In this regard, it must first be said that the Missal published by Paul VI and then republished in two subsequent editions by John Paul II, obviously is and continues to be the normal Form—the Forma ordinaria—of the

Eucharistic Liturgy. The last version of the Missale Romanum prior to the Council, which was

published with the authority of Pope John XXIII in 1962 and used during the Council, will now be able to be used as a *Forma extraordinaria* of the liturgical celebration. It is not appropriate to speak of these two versions of the Roman Missal as if they were “two Rites”. Rather, it is a matter of a twofold use of one and the same rite.

[All Benny needs is a hat and a cane as he repeats the best joke in his *Motu Proprio*. His “bishops,” of course, are expected to agree that a man-made “New Order of Mass,” defined when promulgated as not a Mass, flaunting condemned heresy, perverting Christ’s own most solemn Consecratory Prayer in both word and form, contradicting Christ’s and His Church’s identical sacrificial intention, fraudulently introduced as an experiment, in flagrant violation of laws made to protect our Holy Mass, and in deliberate fracture of solemn oaths sworn by every priest at ordination, bishop at consecration, and pope at installation, all nineteen centuries too late for Revelation,]

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. At the time of the introduction of the new Missal, it did not seem necessary to issue specific norms for the possible use of the earlier Missal. Probably it was thought that it would be a matter of a few individual cases which would be resolved, case by case, on the

local level. Afterwards, however, it soon became apparent that a good number of people remained strongly attached to this usage of the Roman Rite, which had been familiar to them from childhood. This was especially the case in countries where the liturgical movement had provided many people with a notable liturgical formation and a deep, personal familiarity with the earlier Form of the liturgical celebration. We all know that, in the movement led by Archbishop Lefebvre, fidelity to the old Missal became an external mark of identity; the reasons for the break which arose over this, however, were at a deeper level. Many people who clearly accepted the binding character of the Second Vatican Council, and were faithful to the Pope and the Bishops, nonetheless also desired to recover the form of the sacred liturgy that was dear to them. This occurred above all because in many places celebrations were not faithful to the prescriptions of the new Missal, but the latter actually was understood as authorizing or even requiring creativity, which frequently led to deformations of the liturgy which were hard to bear. I am speaking from experience, since I too lived through that period with all its hopes and its confusion. And I have seen how arbitrary deformations of the liturgy caused deep pain to individuals totally rooted in the faith of the Church. [Observe the weeping crocodile!]

Pope John Paul II thus felt obliged to provide, in his *Motu Proprio Ecclesia Dei* (2 July 1988), guidelines for the use of the 1962 Missal; that document, however, did not contain detailed prescriptions but appealed in a general way to the generous response of Bishops [predominantly modernists and/or queers, as well as consecrated invalidly in a new man-made rite] towards the “legitimate aspirations” of those members of the faithful who requested this usage of the Roman Rite. At the time, the Pope primarily wanted to assist the Society of Saint Pius X to recover full unity with the Successor of Peter, and sought to heal a wound experienced ever more painfully. Unfortunately this reconciliation has not yet come about [as this *Motu Proprio* intends].

Nonetheless, a number of communities have gratefully made use of the possibilities provided by the *Motu Proprio*. On the other hand, difficulties remain concerning the use of the 1962 Missal outside of these groups, because of the lack of precise juridical norms, particularly because Bishops, in such cases, frequently feared that the authority of the Council would be called into question. Immediately after the Second Vatican Council it was presumed that requests for the use of the 1962 Missal would be limited to the older generation which had grown up with it, but in the meantime it has clearly been demonstrated that young persons too have discovered this liturgical form, felt its attraction and found in it a form of encounter with the Mystery of the Most Holy Eucharist, particularly suited to them. Thus the need has arisen for a clearer juridical regulation which had not been foreseen at the time of the 1988 *Motu Proprio*. The present Norms are also meant to free Bishops from constantly having to evaluate anew how they are to respond to various situations.

In the second place, the fear was expressed in discussions about the awaited *Motu Proprio*, that

the possibility of a wider use of the 1962 Missal would lead to disarray or even divisions within parish communities. This fear also strikes me as quite unfounded. The use of the old Missal presupposes a certain degree of liturgical formation and some knowledge of the Latin language; neither of these is found very often [especially among the hierarchy and clergy]. Already from these concrete presuppositions, it is clearly seen that the new Missal will certainly remain the ordinary Form of the Roman Rite, not only on account of the juridical norms, but also because of the actual situation of the communities of the faithful. [First you create chaos; then you live with it.]

It is true that there have been exaggerations and at times social aspects unduly linked to the attitude of the faithful attached to the ancient Latin liturgical tradition. Your charity and pastoral prudence will be an incentive and guide for improving these. For that matter, the two Forms of the usage of the Roman Rite [again that side-splitting joke!] can be mutually enriching [time to regurgitate!]: new Saints and some of the new Prefaces can and should be inserted in the old Missal. The “*Ecclesia Dei*” Commission, in contact with various bodies devoted to the *usus antiquior*, will study the practical possibilities in this regard. The celebration of the Mass according to the Missal of Paul VI will be able to demonstrate, more powerfully than has been the case hitherto, the sacrality which attracts many people to the former usage. The most sure guarantee that the Missal of Paul VI can unite parish communities and be loved by them consists in its being celebrated with great reverence in harmony with the liturgical directives. This will bring out the spiritual richness and the theological depth of this Missal. [This antipope has obviously no regard for his own credibility.]

I now come to the positive reason which motivated my decision to issue this *Motu Proprio* updating that of 1988. It is a matter of coming to an interior reconciliation in the heart of the Church. Looking back over the past, to the divisions which in the course of the centuries have rent the Body of Christ, one continually has the impression that, at critical moments when divisions were coming about, not enough was done by the Church’s leaders to maintain or regain reconciliation and unity.

One has the impression that omissions on the part of the Church have had their share of blame for the fact that these divisions were able to harden. [We failed to love Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer enough.] This glance at the past imposes an obligation on us today: to make every effort to enable for all those who truly desire unity to remain in that unity or to attain it anew. [To recover unity we need only return to it, as before the Second Vatican Council.]

There is no contradiction between the two editions of the Roman Missal. [This joke is wearing thin.] In the history of the liturgy there is growth and progress, but no rupture. 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. Needless to say, in order to experience full communion, the priests of the communities adhering to the former usage cannot, as a matter of principle, exclude celebrating according to the new books. [A virtual abrogation of Pope St., Pius V’s *Quo primum tempore*. “We grant and concede in perpetuity that, for the chanting or the reading of the Mass in any church whatsoever, this Missal is hereafter to be followed absolutely, without any scruple of conscience or fear of incurring any penalty, judgment, or censure and may freely and lawfully be used. Nor are superiors, administrators, canons, chaplains, and other secular priests or religious, of whatever order or by whatever title designated, obliged to celebrate Mass otherwise than as enjoined by Us. We likewise declare and ordain that no one whosoever is to be forced or coerced to alter this Missal, and that this present document cannot be revoked or modified, but remain always valid and retain its full force.”] The total exclusion of the new rite would not in fact be consistent with the recognition of its value and holiness. [The joke has worn out!]

In conclusion, dear Brothers, I very much wish to stress that these new norms do not in any way lessen your own authority and responsibility, either for the liturgy or for the pastoral care of your faithful. Each Bishop, in fact, is the moderator of the liturgy in his own Diocese [*status quo ante!*] (cf. *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 22: “*Sacrae Liturgiae moderatio ab Ecclesiae auctoritate unice pendet quae quidem est apud Apostolicam Sedem et, ad normam iuris, apud Episcopum*”). [Translation: Regulation of the liturgy depends solely on the authority of the Church, that is, on

the Apostolic See, and, as laws may determine, on the bishop.]

Nothing is taken away, then, from the authority of the Bishop, whose role remains that of being watchful that all is done in peace and serenity. Should some problem arise which the parish priest cannot resolve, the local Ordinary will always be able to intervene, in full harmony, however, with all that has been laid down by the new norms of the *Motu Proprio*. [A blueprint for dodging responsibility.]

Furthermore, I invite you, dear Brothers, to send to the Holy See an account of your experiences, three years after this *Motu Proprio* has taken effect. If truly serious difficulties come to light, ways to remedy them can be sought.

Dear Brothers, with gratitude and trust, I entrust to your hearts as Pastors these pages and the norms of the *Motu Proprio*. Let us always be mindful of the words of the Apostle Paul addressed to the presbyters of Ephesus: “Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers, to care for the Church of God which he obtained with the blood of his own Son” (Acts 20:28).

I entrust these norms to the powerful intercession of Mary, Mother of the Church, and I cordially impart my Apostolic Blessing to you, dear Brothers, to the parish priests of your dioceses, and to all the priests, your co-workers, as well as to all your faithful.

Given at Saint Peter’s, 7 July 2007

BENEDICTUS PP. XVI

This letter and the *motu proprio* which it clarifies carry all the authority of a career heretic, ineligible according to reason and Canon Law for any and all offices in the Catholic Church, and unable to fill the office of Bishop of Rome by reason of invalid ordination/consecration to the episcopacy according to a 1969 man-made ritual. We have always expected return of the Mass when the properly ordained priests who have been sacramentally empowered to celebrate it have either died or retired. Ratzinger has thrown us a bone which he knew we would refuse. Ratzinger, refusing to recognize our position, will affect surprise that we reject what we have ever demanded, return of the traditional Mass. We shall not settle for less than return of the whole Catholic Church. Nor shall we deal with a non-Catholic (Ratzinger) to secure it.

* * * * *

In his book **Faith and the Future**. Published in 1970 in Germany, Father **Joseph Ratzinger** discusses how the Catholic Faith should face the challenge of modern science. When Ratzinger proposes the objections it becomes clear that he endorses much of the revolutionary criticism of science regarding the Bible.

Let us look at the critic’s points in broad lines. The difficulty already begins with the first page of the Bible. The idea of the world’s origin developed there is in evident contradiction with everything we know today about the origin of the cosmos. Even if we say that those pages are not a manual of natural history and, therefore, should not be understood as a literal description of the cosmos’ origin, a bad feeling remains. On almost every page of the Bible such questions persist. [A persistent reader?] The figure formed of clay that in God’s hands becomes man is largely incomprehensible to us, as well as what happens right afterward with the woman. Taken from his side while he sleeps and recognized by him as the flesh of his own flesh. That is, as a response to the question of his solitude.

Perhaps today we have to re-learn how to understand these images as profound symbolic expressions regarding man. In the next chapter (the history of the fall) new questions rise. How can we reconcile them with the concept that man, as demonstrated by natural science, did not begin from above, but from below? He did not fall, but little by little ascended, increasingly becoming a man from an animal. And what about Paradise? Suffering and death already existed in the world long before man existed,

Let us continue to examine these questions and contradictions that distress the general conscience in order to appraise with all necessary harshness the problem behind the words faith

and knowledge.

After the report of the fall, the Bible continues with its image of history, where Adam is described to us in a cultural period situated around 4000 BC. This date agrees with the biblical counting of time, resulting that around 4000 years have passed from the beginning until Christ. But today all of us know that before this event, a period of hundreds of thousands of years of life and human efforts had already passed, a time not taken into consideration in the biblical image of history, which was restricted to the Eastern understanding of that time. [The Chosen Morons!]

With this we touch the next point: the Bible, which faith venerates as the word of God, became clear to us [recently] in its entire human character through the historical-critical method of investigation. It not only follows the literary forms of its ambience, but also is influenced by the world in which it originated. This influence marked its way of thinking and its religious character itself.

Can we still believe in the God who calls Moses in the burning bush? The God who kills the firstborn sons of Egypt and leads His people to war against the inhabitants of Canaan? Who makes Oza fall dead because he touched the sacred ark? Or were all these things merely an expression of the old East, interesting, yes; perhaps even significant as a level of the human conscience; but not the expression of the divine word? [Who gave us the Bible?] —Joseph Ratzinger, *Fe e Futuro*, Sao Paulo: Vozes, 1971, pp. 11-13

[This antipope obviously entertains no belief in original sin. If we are superior to our origins, to whom do we owe obedience? If we honor our parents, how much more should we honor our grandchildren! Are they not two steps closer to perfection? Possibly Ratzinger has no children. Has he then achieved perfection? Why, then, can he not think straight? Whom does he pretend to represent? An incredible deity? From what were we redeemed? By Whom? Who but a divine person could effect Redemption?

Witnesses to creation are in short supply. If we evolved, what is our purpose? Who has defined it? Who will tell us when we shall have achieved it? Whither shall we go from thither?]

Evolution is a *Fait Accompli* to which the Church Must Adapt. [Is it finished? Or will adaptation continue?] [In a context wherein he tries to justify the adaptation of Vatican II to the modern world, Fr. Ratzinger describes and accepts evolution as a characteristic of the modern world to which theology must adapt. We insist, the excerpt is not taken out of context. In his book is no negative criticism of this modern attitude. It is presented as a *fait accompli*.]

The dream of Daedalus and Icarus of flying to heaven is no longer a distant myth that ends with resignation to the earthly gravity of man, who was not given wings. It can be realized, because the hand of man reaches even to “heaven”; the impossible no longer exists. The strictly outlined boundaries of essences disappear, the mobility of the present day stands out, the doctrine of evolution becomes, so to speak, intrinsically credible and achievable for man. we are witnesses of how everything that exists can never be finished, witnesses to a reality that is not stability, but evolution. ... man looks to the future. “Progress” is the world that characterizes him, not “tradition,” “hope,” “faith.” He has a certain romanticism about the past. He likes to surround himself with precious things from History, but all this only confirms that those epochs are gone and that the kingdom of today’s man is tomorrow, the world that he himself builds. For what is hoped for, different from the early Church, is not the kingdom of God, but the kingdom of man; it is not the return of the Son of man, but the definitive emergence of a rational, free and fraternal order.

Man expects salvation from himself, and seems to be capable of giving it. Thus, with the primacy of the future is linked the primacy of praxis, a primacy of human activity before all other attitudes. Theology also increasingly opens itself to this attitude, orthopraxis enters the picture against orthodoxy, “eschatopraxis” seems more important than eschatology. (Joseph Ratzinger. *Fé e Futuro*, Petropolis: Vozes, 1971, pp. 60-61)

Contrary to what the Church always taught, Ratzinger defended that Faith is not primarily an ensemble of truths which the faithful must profess to be saved, but rather it is a personal testimony that may change according to history.

“Regarding the Christian faith, the thing that really troubles us is largely the burden of the plethora of theses accumulated in the course of history that now present themselves all together to man demanding faith.

“Fundamentally, people want to be liberated from this [the world of planning] just as much as from the old-fashioned faith, which by its contradiction to modern knowledge, has become such an oppressive burden to them.” (Joseph Ratzinger. **Fé e Futuro**, Petropolis: Vozes, 1971, p. 17)

In an earlier book Ratzinger analyzed the Tridentine Mass: The [liturgical] additions of the late Middle Ages were eliminated, and at the same time severe measures were adopted to prevent a rebirth. At that time, the fate of the Western liturgy was linked to a set authority, which worked in a strictly bureaucratic way, lacking any historic vision and considering the problem of the liturgy from the sole viewpoint of rubrics and ceremonies, like a problem of etiquette in a saint’s court, so to speak.

As a consequence of this link, there was a complete archaeologization of the liturgy, which from the state of a living history was changed into that of pure conservation and, therefore, condemned to an internal death. Liturgy became once and forever a closed construction, firmly petrified. The more it was concerned about the integrity of pre-existent formulas, the more it lost its connection to concrete devotions The baroque carved it [the liturgy] super-imposing a people’s para-liturgy over its true and proper archaeologized liturgy. The solemn baroque mass, through the splendor of the orchestra’s performance, became a kind of sacred opera, in which the songs of the priest had their role as did the alternating recitals. On the ordinary days that did not allow such a performance, devotions that followed the people’s mentality were often added to the mass. (Joseph Ratzinger. *Problemi e risultati del Concilio Vaticano II*, Brescia: Queriniana 1967, pp. 25-27)

Ratzinger’s aforementioned books have been selectively quoted by Atila Sinke Guimaraes on the internet. We reprint from them to demonstrate Ratzinger’s permanent modernist bent and long adherence to heresy. We had a sneaking suspicion of both from his behavior at the Second Vatican Council, and from his failure to address our 24-page delation of Garrulous Karolus the Koran-Kisser for heresy, submitted to his Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

He has clearly supported Evolution, which not even Darwin believed, against the Bible, guaranteed by the Church for sixteen centuries, part of the Deposit of Faith which a pope is sworn to preserve. He has denigrated the Scholastics who developed our philosophy and theology. He has ridiculed the traditional Mass, older than both, which he pretends to return to us poor idiots. Typical behavior of a typical pope!

* * * * *

THE WAR IS NOW! No. 73, March 2008

In Cultural Currents (September issue), Max Cunningham has completely misread Benedict XVI’s direction. According to his source, **The Remnant** July issue, Benny’s *Motu Proprio* “granted unrestricted use of the immemorial Mass of Tradition throughout the universal Church.” He reports hostile reaction to Benny’s camouflage from the ADL, liberal Catholics, and their useless hierarchy. This may be true if the reactors cannot read the plainest fog.

We hated and despised Traditional Catholics realize that our Traditional Mass was not stolen by the Second Vatican Council, which nowhere authorized or recommended such a sacrilegious course, and that this latest pronouncement, from the same Unholy See which robbed us, has restored nothing.

On that black day on which Paul VI officially introduced his new “mass,” he (1) exceeded papal competence; (2) claimed to execute the mythical orders of the Second Vatican Council, to which he owed no obedience; (3) imposed a new, invalid “sacrament” of Holy Orders, to prevent return of our Mass. The papacy’s purpose is preservation. A pope may not innovate. Nothing new is Catholic. A pope convokes a council. Nothing a council produces has effect unless and until a

pope signs and promulgates it. One ordained with an invalid sacrament has no power to offer Mass. For years we have expected “return” of our Mass when almost no one can provide it.

Ratzinger has thrown us a bone which will, he believes, cut down our numbers by appeasing those who are satisfied with the appearance of unity, the first mark of the Church. If he had genuinely restored our Mass, he would not thereby have satisfied the traditionalist, who demands return of his entire Church, including doctrine, morals, clergy, hierarchy, and pope.

After a superficial, inaccurate analysis of the differences among various types of Catholics, Mr. Cunningham tells it like it is: “It is completely impossible that a Catholic Church in America, with a traditional Mass restored, could continue unchecked with its penchant for pedophilia, homo-ism, funny money, ultra-left wing ideology, and New Age religious mantras. The Old Latin Mass, universally instituted, would erase the Vatican Two New Age regime.”

Ratzinger’s new *Motu Proprio* restores nothing, though it pretends to return John XXIII’s 1962 innovation. But why should we expect universal restoration of the traditional Mass to solve all our problems? Were we not all favored with the Mass when all these troubles arose?

Letter to (among others) some of the Roman Curia June 19, 2007

... grateful that the Tridentine Latin Mass is now permitted to be celebrated by any priest again. ... most [U.S.A.] traditional Catholics ... do not accept the sacraments of the post-Vatican II era due to changes in [sacramental] essentials ... will not accept the post-Vatican II ordinations of these younger priests of the Novus Ordo Church. [Obviously I wrote none of this. Msgr. Camille Perl, Secretary of the Pontifical Commission Ecclesia Dei, replied.]

25 July 2007

In terms of Catholic teaching there can be no question of re-ordaining priests according to the antecedent rite of ordination if they have already been validly ordained (cf. Catechism of the Catholic Church #1582). Once a priest is validly ordained, he is a priest forever. In his recent *Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum* our Holy Father Pope Benedict XVI has made it clear that any validly ordained Catholic priest who has no impediment to the exercise of his priestly ministry may celebrate the Mass according to the 1962 Roman Missal. [Not the Tridentine Mass, then.]

Those who refuse to accept priests who have been validly ordained according to the postconciliar liturgical books and who distinguish themselves from the “Novus Ordo Church” are effectively separating themselves from the faith and practice of the Holy Catholic Church.

[When I look back over the nearly forty years in which I courted excommunication from the postconciliar “Church,” I marvel at the simplicity of the solution. You could have done it any time you wanted, couldn’t you, Mr. Perl.]

* * * * *

“**Latest SSPX News from Rome**” according to “Father” Robinson contains no news whatsoever, but merely false interpretations, surmises, and unwarranted predictions. Obviously SSPX has made a deal with Ratzinger, and we must wait breathlessly for its stunning revelation.

The first question contradicts itself. When will Ratzinger lift the excommunication which never happened? If it never happened why would it be lifted? “We don’t know when.” But soon is possible. Never is equally possible. Either way, only Ratzinger benefits. Either he acts like a pope and disciplines this recalcitrant group which recognizes his papacy, or he welcomes back his prodigal sons to the feast and recognizes their orders as counterfeit as his own.

“The Pope, *it seems*, is open to our criticisms of the Council texts, and he himself is *beginning to* go against the novelty of ‘collegiality’ by enforcing the *Motu Proprio* of 7/7/07.” But his letter to the bishops which accompanied the *Motu Proprio* left the bishops in charge and responsible.

“He is also trying to correct” (*a pope needs not try; he corrects right now!*) “the Vatican II

understanding” (*heresy*) “that all false religions have the means of salvation, and the true Church merely ‘subsists’ in the Catholic Church. He has re-interpreted” (*but not corrected nor condemned*) “that to be ‘identity’,” (*which supposedly negates the rest of the allied heresies embraced in Vatican II’s Ecumenism 3 & 4*).

“One bishop in the USA, it was *reported*,” (*substantiated?*) “... will NOT allow the Latin Mass, and so the Pope appointed an assistant bishop who immediately established this Mass” (*on alternate Tuesdays?*) “Pope Benedict will also write ...” (*in God’s good time?*)

* * * * *

Vatican defrocks convicted priest Donald McGuire

A Jesuit priest convicted of molesting students at a Chicago area Catholic school in the 1960s was officially defrocked Friday. Donald J. McGuire has been permanently removed from all clerical functions, said a statement from Rev. Edward Schmidt, the head of the Chicago order of the Society of Jesus to which McGuire belonged. McGuire [at one time] Spiritual adviser to Mother Teresa, was convicted of molesting two students from Loyola Academy in Wilmette in the 1960s. He has also been accused of molesting others on various occasions from the 1960s through 2002 Though they welcomed news of McGuire’s removal from the priesthood, attorneys and advocates for the victims said it was more symbolic than substantive.

“.... it’s little consolation to those kids and families whose lives and souls have been ruined and betrayed by the leadership as well as McGuire,” said Jeff Anderson, a lawyer who has represented five of the priest’s accusers. “It’s a beginning, but it’s just so little, so late.”

McGuire, 77, lives in Oak Lawn and travels frequently to Cleveland for medical treatment. (No local psychiatrists or surgeons? But look at the bright side: McGuire is not in jail.) A lawyer for McGuire said he was saddened by the news of his dismissal. (Our hearts go out to this lawyer. Will this affect size or collectibility of his legal fees?)

Crimes of this stripe attract accusations against the Catholic Church. We cannot blame the Church for behavior of its failures. Faced with clerical molestation of their children, most Catholics of our acquaintance would have left no problem for the authorities except whether pederasts could be buried in consecrated ground.

* * * * *

Ratzinger has opportunely, in time for Holy Week, **addressed the problem of the ages**: that what we say in prayer to God offends the Jews. (How fares the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity in official rabbinical prayer?) For how many centuries has the Church prayed for the greatest benefit imaginable for all men, conversion. For this is the ordinary road to Salvation, which neither God nor His Church would deny anyone. If we omitted the Jews they could logically accuse us of discrimination.

At the same time we must realize that they diametrically oppose us in focus on the central point in history and its major effect on civilization. Civilization, as opposed to order, begins and ends with Jesus Christ, without Whom can exist no charity, little hope, and only false faith.

What are we to think when faced with a self-styled vicar of Christ that uses his usurped position to mollify those who have definitively and consciously rejected our God and His Salvation, while he treats adherents to God’s immutable doctrine with inconsistent public relations myths? Should we not expect preferential treatment? Is there a Good Friday prayer for the return of the traditional Catholic? From what would he return? To what could he return?

Is it not strange that among the almost universal innovations, to which Ratzinger has himself contributed so generously, the prayer to which the Jews object has remained? Could it have been the sole point of agreement between tradition and postconciliarism? Note the inexorability of detection.

Even in the days of genuine popes and orthodox curias, the divine mission and support of the

Catholic Church proved itself through the utter incompetence of those in charge. This matches the unique success of twelve uneducated members of a despised tribe from a backwater of the Roman Empire. The power, in both cases, lay not in the messenger but in the message. It is high time that we all re-examine the entire message, which hangs together like no other in history. Ask not what you can do for your Church. Ask rather what your “Church” has done for you since Vatican II?

* * * * *

At one time I reluctantly believed that rendering Mass into the vernacular↓unnecessary for me↓might help others, especially non-Catholics. Experience has demonstrated the error of this opinion, due partly to inadequacy of the uninspired translations. I have never understood the pride a certain priest seems to have taken in his membership in the ICEL, which foisted such a near approach to pidgin English on literate Catholics, many of whom shared my aforesaid reluctant belief. The translations obviously needed help, which was predictably refused. But they distracted us from the outright refusal better translation might have engendered.

I can even recall one priest who liked the new “mass”; he was lazy. And a middle-aged woman once told me that she appreciated the vernacular.

“All those years going to church I never understood a word the priest was saying.” To which the obvious reply was: “He wasn’t talking to you!”

Una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro

I have recently seen a loose, overlong treatment of *una cum* in the *Te igitur* of the traditional Mass canon by John Lane, who attempted to justify association of the name of an apostate, undeniably heretical usurper (Garrulous Karolus the Koran Kisser) with the papacy. Mr. Lane delves into almost every conceivable aspect of this forbidden phrase.

Among the articles preceding the Mass text in the traditional Missal, and governing the use thereof, is the section, “*Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae*” (Rite to be preserved in celebration of Mass). Item VIII, *De Canone Missae usque ad Consecrationem* (Concerning the Canon of the Mass up to the Consecration) reads in part: “*Ubi dicit: una cum famulo tuo Papa Nostro N. exprimit nomen Papae: Sede autem vacante verba praedicta omittuntur.*” (Where he says: one with Thy servant our Pope NAME he expresses the Pope’s name: but when the See is vacant the aforesaid words are omitted.)

Catholics have an absolute right to demand that priests adhere to this Missal, which here prescribes that these words *una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro* (in red) are omitted when there is no pope. [Similarly, the next few words, *et Antistite nostro N.*, must be omitted in the absence of a genuine local ordinary. We cannot allow ourselves to be united in any way with heretics, schismatics, or wildcats lower than the non-existent pope.]

Since Mr. Lane agrees that the Holy See was vacant at the time he wrote, his entire article is thus shown irrelevant. Furthermore, each issue he raised therein is equally irrelevant, whether or not priest and/or congregation believe or consider the Holy See vacant. He begs question after question. Toward the end he begs us to believe that because he has posed earlier questions he has settled them.

He implies that these words have no effect since the congregation doesn’t hear them. *Ritus Servandus, VIII prescribes: incipit Canonem, secreto dicens: Te igitur ([the priest] begins the Canon, secretly saying: Te igitur), and we never hear another word until Nobis quoque peccatoribus after the Commemoration of the Dead. Would Mr. Lane deny effect to the Consecration because no one hears the words?*

Mr. Lane also assumes that the priest may speak for only himself, and may be excused for an erroneous, unmindful, or habitual variation. But the words themselves of the *Te igitur* exclude

this. “..... *supplices rogamus ac petimus quae tibi offerimus pro Ecclesia tua sancta Catholica: quam pacificare, custodire, adunare, et regere digneris toto orbe terrarum: una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro, etc.*” [we humbly ask and seek which we offer Thee for Thy holy Catholic Church: which Thou wilt deign to preserve in peace, guard, unite, and rule throughout the whole world: one with Thy servant our Pope, etc.] The celebrant does not here pray for a pope; rather he unites himself and all present, and all orthodox keepers of the Catholic and Apostolic Faith with apostate heretical usurpers hell-bent on destruction of the Catholic Church.

And this, may we re-emphasize, in violation of the law!

* * * * *

I intended to continue **comparison of the 1917 Code of Canon Law** with its illegitimate 1983 substitute. The laws on marriage were next. But there are too many; we would drift quickly into the land of dreams, where who knows how many legislators we might encounter.

I cite the first half of one canon of the 131 in the Code: Canon 1013 §1. The primary end of marriage is the procreation and education of children; the secondary end, mutual support and the relief of concupiscence.

No trace remains of this basic, highly pertinent and relevant half-canon in the entire 110 “laws” of the 1983 document, though we know the codifiers were aware of it because they included in their substitute the second half of the original law. They bowed to a major innovation of the Second Vatican Council:

Vatican II (Church in the Modern World, 50): Marriage and conjugal love are by their nature ordained toward the begetting and educating of children Hence, while not making the other purposes of matrimony of less account, the true practice of conjugal love, etc. (Footnote: The Commission charged with drafting this text made every effort to avoid any appearance of wishing to settle questions concerning a hierarchy of the “ends” of marriage.)

So they pretended that no such hierarchy had been established—or reinforced by Canon Law (Canon 1013).

Decree of the Holy Office, April 1, 1944, approved by Pope Pius XII, March 30, 1944: Can we entertain the opinion of some modern authorities who deny that the primary end of marriage is procreation and education, or teach that the secondary ends are not necessarily subordinate to the primary one but are equally important and independent? The members of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office have decided to reply in the negative.

St. Thomas Aquinas (*Summa Theologiae*, Supp III, q. 41, 1): for its principal end, which is the good of the offspring for the secondary end of marriage, which is devoted mutual compliance by the spouses in domestic matters.

This one omission clearly demonstrates the 1983 code’s bias. I cite obvious 1983 innovations:

Canon 1062 §1. A promise of marriage, be it unilateral or bilateral, called an engagement, is regulated by particular law which has been established by the conference of bishops after it has taken into consideration any existing customs and civil laws.

Canon 1067 The conference of bishops is to offer norms concerning the examination of the parties, and the marriage banns and other appropriate means for carrying out the necessary inquiries which are to precede marriage. The pastor can proceed to assist at a marriage after such norms have been diligently observed.

Canon 1083 §1. A man before he has completed his sixteenth year of age, and likewise a woman before she has completed her fourteenth year of age, cannot enter a valid marriage.

§2. It is within the power of the conference of bishops to establish an older age for the licit

celebration of marriage.

Canon 1112 §1. With the prior favorable opinion of the conference of bishops and after permission of the Holy See has been obtained, the diocesan bishop can delegate lay persons to assist at marriages where priests or deacons are lacking.

§2. A suitable lay person is to be chosen who is capable of giving instruction to those to be wed and qualified to perform the marriage liturgy correctly.

Canon 1120 The conference of bishops can draw up its own marriage ritual, to be reviewed by the Holy See; such a ritual, in harmony with the usages of the area and its people adapted to the Christian spirit, must provide that the person assisting at the marriage be present, ask for the manifestation of the contractants' consent and receive it.

Canon 1121 §1. After a marriage has been celebrated, the pastor of the place of celebration or the person who takes his place, even if neither has assisted at the marriage, should as soon as possible note the following in the marriage register: the names of the spouses, the person who assisted and the witnesses, the place and date of the marriage celebration; these notations are to be made in accord with the method prescribed by the conference of bishops or the diocesan bishop.

Canon 1126 The conference of bishops is to establish the way in which these declarations and promises, which are always required, are to be made, what proof of them there should be in the external forum, and how they are to be brought to the attention of the non-Catholic party.

Canon 1127 §1. The prescriptions of canon 1108 are to be observed concerning the form to be employed in a mixed marriage; if a Catholic party contracts marriage with a non-Catholic of an oriental rite, the canonical form of celebration is to be observed only for liceity; for validity, however, the presence of a sacred minister is required along with the observance of the other requirements of law.

§2. If serious difficulties pose an obstacle to the observance of the canonical form, the local ordinary of the Catholic party has the right to dispense from the form in individual cases, but after consulting the ordinary of the place where the marriage is to be celebrated and with due regard, for validity, for some public form of celebration; the conference of bishops is to issue norms by which such a dispensation may be granted in an orderly manner.

[Symbiosis in action! Two rank innovations support each other. Obviously both need all support available. The relation of the married(?) to the bishops' conference has not been determined, nor has the relevance of the bishops' conference itself. It is based on Vatican II, which hoped to find some use for it, aside from the obvious intent to share responsibility for the disaster. We might blame the pope!

What is an Episcopal Conference? Whom does it represent? What is its authority or purpose? No definition. Paul VI himself said that eventually in practice it would become clear how to define it and demarcate its powers. Ignorant of their objective, our bishops went straight into conferences. The greater the importance and power these Conferences assume, the more the individual bishops are eliminated. The episcopacy, the real structure of the Church of Our Lord, disappears into committee.]

Wojtyla's Introduction to the 1983 Code:

“If one asks why John XXIII had clearly perceived the need to reform the current Code, perhaps the answer is found in the 1917 Code itself. [A pregnant—but unextended—statement!] There is however another reason, the principal one, namely that the reform of the Code of Canon Law was seen to be directly sought and requested by the Council itself [**not yet convoked**], which had particularly concentrated its attention upon the Church.

“As is quite clear, when the first announcement of the revision of the Code was made, the Council was something totally in the future. Moreover, the acts of its teaching authority, and particularly its teaching on the Church, were to be developed over the years 1962-65.

Nevertheless, one cannot fail to see that John XXIII's insight was most accurate, and his proposal must rightly be acknowledged as one which looked well ahead to the good of the Church."... [Additional proof of his invalidating intent to impose essential change on the eternal Church.]

"If we now turn our attention to the nature of the labours which preceded the promulgation of the Code and to the manner in which they were performed, especially during the Pontificates of Paul VI, John Paul I and then up to this present day it is vital to make quite clear that these labours were brought to their conclusion in an eminently collegial spirit. This not only relates to the external composition of the work, but it affects also the very substance of the laws which have been drawn up.

"This mark of collegiality by which the process of this Code's origin was prominently characterized, is entirely in harmony with the teaching authority and the nature of the Second Vatican Council. The Code therefore, not only because of its content but because of its origin, demonstrates the spirit of this Council in whose documents the Church, the universal sacrament of salvation (cf. Const. Lumen Gentium, n. 9, 48), is presented as the People of God, and its hierarchical Constitution is shown as founded on the College of Bishops [a blatant innovaton!] together with its Head.

"For this reason therefore, the Bishops and Episcopal Conferences were invited to associate themselves with the work of preparing the new Code, so that through a task of such length, in as collegial a manner as possible, little by little the juridical formulae would come to maturity and would then serve the whole Church.

"In promulgating this Code today, therefore, we are fully conscious that this act stems from our pontifical authority itself, and so assumes a primatial nature. Yet we are no less aware that in its content this Code reflects the collegial solicitude of all our brothers in the episcopate." [Big Shirk!]

Vatican II's Decree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office in the Church, 38, 4):

"Decisions of the episcopal conference, provided they have been made lawfully and by choice of at least two-thirds of the prelates who have a deliberative vote in the conference, and have been reviewed by the Apostolic See, are to have juridically binding force in those cases and in those only which are prescribed by common law or determined by special mandate of the Apostolic See, given spontaneously or in response to a petition from the conference itself."

Among the eighty-eight canons of the 1983 Code in which Bishops' Conferences receive mention, several reiterate and re-emphasize the fact that these conferences must submit all majority decisions to Roman (papal) approval.

Canon 237 §2 An inter-diocesan seminary may not be established unless the prior approval of the Apostolic See has been obtained, both for the establishment of the seminary and for its statutes. Approval is also required from the Episcopal Conference if the seminary is for the whole of its territory; otherwise, from the Bishops concerned.

Canon 242 §1 In each country there is to be a Charter of Priestly Formation. It is to be drawn up by the Episcopal Conference, taking account of the norms issued by the supreme ecclesiastical authority, and it is to be approved by the Holy See; moreover, it is to be adapted to new circumstances, likewise with the approval of the Holy See.

Canon 439 §1 A plenary council for all the particular Churches of the same Episcopal Conference is to be celebrated as often as the Episcopal Conference, with the approval of the Apostolic See, considers it necessary or advantageous.

Canon 441 It is the responsibility of the Episcopal Conference: 1° to convene a plenary council; 2° to choose a place within the territory of the Episcopal Conference for the celebration of the council; 3° to elect from among the diocesan Bishops a president of the plenary council, who is to be approved by the Apostolic See;

4° to determine the order of business and the matters to be considered, to announce when the plenary council is to begin and how long it is to last, and to transfer, prorogue and dissolve it.

Canon 448 §1 As a general rule, the Episcopal Conference includes those who preside over all the particular Churches of the same country, in accordance with Canon 450.

§2 An Episcopal Conference can, however, be established for a territory of greater or less extent if the Apostolic See, after consultation with the diocesan Bishops concerned, judges that circumstances suggest this. Such a Conference would include only the Bishops of some particular Churches in a certain territory, or those who preside over particular Churches in different countries. It is for the Apostolic See to lay down special norms for each case.

Canon 449 §1 It is for the supreme authority of the Church alone, after consultation with the Bishops concerned, to establish, suppress, or alter Episcopal Conferences.

Canon 451 Each Episcopal Conference is to draw up its own statutes, to be reviewed by the Apostolic See. In these, among other things, arrangements for the plenary meetings of the Conference are to be set out, and provision is to be made for a permanent committee of Bishops, and a general secretary of the Conference, and for other offices and commissions by which, in the judgment of the Conference, its purpose [?] can more effectively be achieved.

Canon 455 §1 The Episcopal Conference can make general decrees only in cases where the universal law has so prescribed, or by special mandate of the Apostolic See, either on its own initiative or at the request of the Conference itself.

§2 For the decrees mentioned in §1 validly to be enacted at a plenary meeting, they must receive two thirds of the votes of those who belong to the Conference with a deliberative vote. These decrees do not oblige until they have been reviewed by the Apostolic See and lawfully promulgated.

Canon 456 When a plenary meeting of the Episcopal Conference has been concluded, its minutes are to be sent by the president to the Apostolic See for information, and its decrees, if any, for review.

Canon 459 §1 Relations are to be fostered between Episcopal Conferences, especially neighboring ones, in order to promote and defend whatever is for the greater good.

§2 The Apostolic See must be consulted whenever actions or affairs undertaken by Conferences have an international character.

Canon 753 Although they do not enjoy infallible teaching authority, the bishops in communion with the head and members of the college, whether as individuals or gathered in conferences of bishops or in particular councils, are authentic teachers and instructors of the faith for the faithful entrusted to their care; the faithful must adhere to the authentic teaching of their own bishops with a sense of religious respect.

Canon 755 §1. It is within the special competence of the entire college of bishops and of the Apostolic See to promote and direct the participation of Catholics in the ecumenical movement, whose purpose is the restoration of unity among all Christians, which the Church is bound by the will of Christ to promote.

Canon 756 §1 The office of preaching the Gospel to the whole Church has been committed principally to the Roman Pontiff and [by whom?] to the [new] College of Bishops.

Canon 825 §1 Books of the sacred Scriptures may not be published unless they are approved by the Apostolic See or the Episcopal Conference. The publication of translations of the sacred Scriptures requires the approval of the same authority, and they must have necessary and sufficient explanatory notes.

§2 With the permission of the Episcopal Conference, Catholic members of Christ's faithful, in cooperation with separated brethren, may prepare and publish versions of the Scriptures, with appropriate explanatory notes.

Canon 838 §1. The supervision of the sacred liturgy depends solely on the authority of the

Church which resides in the Apostolic See and, in accord with the law, the diocesan bishop. [Clearly, new worship and sacraments came not from the bishops' conferences!]

§2. It is for the Apostolic See to order the sacred liturgy of the universal Church, to publish the liturgical books, to review their translations into the vernacular languages and to see that liturgical ordinances are faithfully observed everywhere.

§3. It pertains to the conferences of bishops [returned!] to prepare translations of the liturgical books into the vernacular languages, with the appropriate adaptations within the limits defined in the liturgical books themselves, and to publish them with the prior review by the Holy See.

Canon 844 §1 Catholic ministers may lawfully administer the sacraments only to Catholic members of Christ's faithful, who equally may lawfully receive them only from Catholic ministers, except as provided in §§2, 3 and 4 of this Canon and in Canon 861 §2.

§2 Whenever necessity requires or a genuine spiritual advantage commends it, and provided the danger of error or indifferentism is avoided, Christ's faithful for whom it is physically or morally impossible to approach a Catholic minister, may lawfully receive the sacraments of penance, the Eucharist and anointing of the sick from non-Catholic ministers in whose Churches these sacraments are valid.

§3 Catholic ministers may lawfully administer the sacraments of penance, the Eucharist and anointing of the sick to members of the eastern Churches not in full communion with the Catholic Church, if they spontaneously ask for them and are properly disposed. The same applies to members of other Churches which the Apostolic See judges to be in the same position as the aforesaid eastern Churches so far as the sacraments are concerned.

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

§5 In respect of the cases dealt with in §§2, 3 and 4, the diocesan Bishop or the Episcopal Conference is not to issue general norms except after consultation with the competent authority, at least at the local level, of the non-Catholic Church or community concerned. [Canon 844 certainly yells for comment↓from the brothers Grimm! Its concocters appear to recognize the superiority of traditional sacraments to the empty forms of the postconciliar "Church."]

Canon 1031 §1. The presbyterate is not to be conferred upon those who have not yet completed the age of twenty-five and who do not possess sufficient maturity; an interval of at least six months is to be observed between the diaconate and the presbyterate; men destined for the presbyterate are to be admitted to the order of diaconate only after they have completed the age of twenty-three.

§2. A candidate for the permanent diaconate who is not married is not to be admitted to the diaconate unless he has completed at least twenty-five years of age; if the candidate is married, he is not to be admitted to the permanent diaconate unless he has completed at least thirty-five years of age and has the consent of his wife.

§3. The conference of bishops may determine a norm by which an older age is required for the presbyterate and the permanent diaconate.

§4. The Apostolic See reserves to itself the dispensation from the age required in §§1 & 2 when it is a question of more than one year.

Canon 1246 §2 However, the Episcopal Conference may, with the prior approval of the Apostolic See, suppress certain holydays of obligation or transfer them to a Sunday.

Canon 1272 In those regions where benefices properly so called still exist, it is for the Episcopal Conference to regulate such benefices by appropriate norms, agreed with and approved by the

Apostolic See. The purpose of these norms is that the income and as far as possible the capital itself of the benefice should by degrees be transferred to the fund mentioned in Canon 1274 §1.

Canon 1439 §1 If a single tribunal of first instance has been constituted for several dioceses, in accordance with the norm of Canon 1423, the Episcopal Conference must, with the approval of the Holy See, constitute a tribunal of second instance, unless the dioceses are all suffragans of the same archdiocese.

§2 Even apart from the cases mentioned in §1, the Episcopal Conference can, with the approval of the Apostolic See, constitute one or more tribunals of second instance.

[Now we're talkin'. We need more tribunals↓to try suits and petitions from the laity for recovery of church property before it must be sold to satisfy judgments against monsters like convicted priest Donald McGuire. The new "Church" might even, let us fondly imagine, use them to try some of these monsters, since they are never turned over to civil authority.]

The remaining fifty-seven 1983 canons which empower the Bishops' Conferences furnish useless tasks for useless men, and constitute an extra administrative level never needed in nineteen centuries. They serve only to distract attention from, and absorb the blame for, antics of antipopes.

Ransacking my files in desperation I found an article on true and false miracles (www.crc-internet.org/aug1a.htm dated 11/21/2001. Somehow the article conveyed the impression that not all incorrupt exhumed bodies are miraculously preserved. It introduced as an example an innovating pope, "prophet of happiness, artisan of disaster," exhumed the day after his beatification. John XXIII knew that his conciliar hoax would eventually fray at the edges, and would require supporting evidence of divine approval↓canonization. Thoughtfully, he provided.

An assistant at the Institute of Anatomy of the Faculty of Medicine of the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Mr. Gennaro Goglia, injected into John's dead body a fluid of his own invention to arrest decomposition. John had imposed responsibility for the preservation process upon his health care team, Professors Valdoni and Mazzoni. Commissioned by these two, Professor Goglia had spent several days concocting the fluid with the help of another doctor, Cassano.

"We did everything in the laboratory of the Institute of Anatomy: ten litres of liquid in a plastic flask with a tap and a long tin tube equipped with a needle," recounted Goglia to the Italian weekly, *Famiglia cristiana* (#22/2001). "... A Vatican car came to fetch me at 7 (p.m.) We loaded our equipment and went up to the papal apartment."

There they met Giacomo Manzu making a clay mold of the face, the Gusso brothers, the pope's domestics, and Professor Mazzoni. They hooked up the equipment and inserted the needle. At 5 a.m. June 4 the operation was complete, and completely successful. This explains the incorrupt state of the exhumed body, but not the statement of one of Roncalli's family that the body interred supine was exhumed prone, which would seem a genuine miracle, considering the elbow room.

The postconciliar "Church," noted for the superabundance of its canonizations, suffers in the quality and quantity of its miraculous support. It seems rather odd that a generation robbed of its ordinary means of salvation should be engulfed in genuine miracles. When, for instance, we encounter the glove of a newly canonized stigmatist which gives off the all-pervasive effluvium of a recognized cheap commercial perfume (Tea Rose) that triggers allergic reactions, we need not rush into belief in its authenticity.

* * * * *

Let us recommend two pamphlets written by Professor Maciej Giertych, a member of the European Parliament. *Civilizations at war in Europe* and *Teaching on evolution in European Schools* have earned the good professor quite a barrage of flak, which is the only way to reach him; he stands six feet eleven inches.

"Evolution ... is not a scientific Law and therefore it should not be taught as such. It should be

presented in schools as a scientific theory pending confirmation, ... that has both supporters and opponents. ... the arguments for the theory and against it should be impartially presented. The pupils must be taught how to evaluate data, how to debate a controversial issue. They must be taught to think on their own. The teaching process should not depend only on feeding facts. It must also teach how to use one's own reason. ↓ last page (34) of *Teaching on evolution in European Schools*, by Maciej Giertych

The Secret Still Hidden, Good Counsel Publications, Pound Ridge, New York, by Christopher Ferrara is dedicated to the Blessed Virgin Mary and somehow also to Benedict XVI. It documents the ambivalent approach of Cardinal Tarcisio Bertone, Vatican Secretary of State, to the Fatima Message, as mistreated on television, radio, and the Vatican newspaper *L'Osservatore Romano*, secretly, behind his pope's back, in 248 fun-filled pages. If Mr. Ferrara continues like this he may end up among us sedevacantists. In Appendix II he presents 101 reasons to doubt Bertone's account ↓ two accounts really, several years apart.

From the book's back cover: "The Cardinal's own statements demonstrate beyond doubt that a text of the Secret has been suppressed, evidently under an unjustifiable mental reservation that the text is not 'authentic.' evidence demonstrates that ↓

"The Secret has two parts, One of which contains words of the Virgin not found in the published vision.

"There are two different Third Secret envelopes, each bearing [Sister Lucy's handwritten] warning that by 'express order of Our Lady' the envelope is not to be opened before 1960.

"There are two different Third Secret locations for these envelopes: the Holy Office archives [and] the papal apartment.

"There are two different Third Secret translations in Italian, neither of which has been made public by the Vatican."

Page 181: "Capovilla (John XXIII's secretary) reveals for the first time that a written Italian translation of the Third Secret was prepared for Pope John XXIII in 1959. According to the official account, the only written translation was prepared on or about March 6, 1967, four years after Pope John died. what was the point of the 1967 translation if a translation had already been prepared in 1959 under the auspices of the Secretary of State and at the Pope's specific request?

Obviously No point ↓ unless the 1959 translation was of a different document. A document which contains difficult Portuguese expressions, which Capovilla mentioned repeatedly in oral and written testimony that he now suddenly declares ... all a mistake. ... would explain why neither ... was ever published."

Now if a (genuine) pope were to say that he is not bound by some one else's visions, and merely to ignore or drop the subject, many of us could appreciate his point. But the New "Church" mob cannot do this, because they themselves have instigated the propagation of countless false apparitions to distract attention from their own invalid innovations. If they ignore this particular private revelation, they will set us all an example for treatment of their own fabrications.

It would appear, then, that they have fumbled the ball badly, and must either bluff with transparent lies or publish truths embarrassing enough utterly to discredit the entire Renewal, if indeed more were needed.

* * * * *

THE WAR IS NOW! No. 74

Let me suggest that you have never received a specific answer to a specific question from a specific usurper of an office in the postconciliar "Church." Somewhere, at some time, some supporter of Catholic Tradition should receive some reaction to his own reaction against impossible innovation. The laity constitutes an essential part of the Catholic Church, and is entitled to a voice in how it is treated and robbed, and to a credible explanation of imposed innovation.

The Catholic Church is the true Church instituted by Jesus Christ because it has never changed its doctrine or morals; change in these fields is inconsistent with eternal truth. The Church is bound to provide its members with the ordinary means of salvation as it so provided for nineteen centuries. These means are instituted by Jesus Christ Himself, and not even His Church is competent to change their intent or their form. Nothing new is Catholic.

What remains unchanged in the present *soi disant* Catholic Church? Heresy and idolatry abound. The rot is universal, and is obviously imposed from the top, following the recognized universal plan to take over all legitimate government, secular or ecclesiastical. Each new interloper confirms our suspicions by dedicating his “pontificate” to further implementation of the Second Vatican Council and its anti-Catholic declarations, documents, and decrees, when he had the opportunity to order the return of our entire tradition. What are we to conclude if not that each new interloper is a heretic and an idolater? If we treat him as a legitimate pope, we accept (follow) his heresy and idolatry.

We should never petition illegitimate Church authorities for our rights and properties, but should rather demand their return as from any other thief. And we should make quite clear that we are forbidden to contribute to non-Catholic religions, especially the postconciliar Church.

Uncounted protesters have questioned and deplored these innovations. The only result is clear demonstration of the fact that all protests are useless; imposition of novelties will continue. Sad experience has taught us the futility of any “reasonable” approach. If we ask we shall be refused.

But we may have left it all too late. There remains no one capable of restoring or returning anything—certainly not Ratzinger. Not only is he an apostate public heretic, he is not even a bishop, having been “consecrated/ordained” according to the 1969 man-made “sacrament” of “Orders.”

Quo primum tempore is the law of the Church. The Protestant Revolt made it necessary to preserve the oldest rite of Mass in existence by law, so that the Church could guarantee it. The law governs use and content of our highest moral obligation, official worship of God. It permits other rites in use at the time for two hundred years or more; which covers the Eastern rites, among others. It may not in the strictest sense fill the requirements for papal infallibility, but it remains divine law codified when necessary in circumstances closely paralleling our own, and unquestionably in force in excess of four centuries. No pope could or would modify it. Only an enemy would try.

When a promoter of known sexual deviates issues a proclamation, I need not parse it to see how much I can accept. I should instead refer to the Arianism and Judaism that he has publicly touted, or the Koran which he has kissed, and demand to know the source of this self-excommunicated apostate’s authority over a Catholic.

Obviously no such basis exists. No one can function as Christ’s vicar unless he adheres publicly to Christ’s religion as Christ revealed it. The last man recognizable as pope died in 1958. Five ineligible impostors have turned our mighty monolith of nineteen centuries into an amorphous shale pit rolling precariously, half-drowned in a quicksand.

The traditional Catholic Family News and The Remnant, neither of which will print a word of mine, nor take an ad for books I have written, sling mud at sedevacantists in blind refusal to quote or discuss logical and Scriptural arguments we advance. We are termed “the sedevacantist enterprise,” which causes us to re-examine our position to determine how we might have shown a financial profit.

Fortunately I need write no more on fact-dodging articles of these sources. Joseph C. Maurer of Wheaton, Illinois tore Christopher Ferrara to shreds. “I never imagined,” Maurer wrote, “that I would see an article in CFN that exhibited such a steady stream of personal disparagement, insult and mean-spirited hectoring,” and wrote twenty-one more pages.

I read most trad “writers” impatiently. When will they get to the point? How relevant is this paragraph (chapter)? Will this ever end? Mr. Maurer is different. Not only has he a firm grip on logic, he has taken the trouble to learn to write. I approach the end of his articles disappointed ↓ that he has not written pages more.

flagmart@sbcglobal.net or 718 E Liberty Dr, Wheaton, IL 60187

* * * * *

I may soon put out a pamphlet on Holy Orders, most of which can be found in three books, as follows.

Is The Pope Catholic?, pp. 108-123 Eldering; Matter And Form Are Necessary To The Sacraments; No Bishops, No Clergy—No Clergy, No Mass!

The Enemy Is Still Here!, pp. 93 (line 34)-94 (line 15); pp. 116 (line 4) -117 (line 11); pp. 197 (lines 5-26); pp. 286 (line 37) -292 (line 34).

The Enemy Is Here!, pp. 340 (line 13)-341 (line 38); pp. 476 (line 20)-477 (line 24).

But now we face an unnecessary complication. For some unknown but silly reason, Pius XII, who had never spent a day in a seminary, took it upon himself to issue his(?) *Sacramentum Ordinis*, in which he decided to redefine the form of priestly ordination. For centuries the form had been the words accompanying the Tradition of the Instruments: “Receive the power to offer sacrifice to God and to celebrate Mass for the living as well as for the dead.” This is the quintessence, and chief purpose, of the priesthood. But it could not be the form because, said Pius XII, it did not occur in Eastern Rite ordinations—as irrelevant and illogical an objection as can be imagined.

The forms merely differ, as in Baptism and Confirmation. There was no need to denigrate the most specific. The Latin Rite followed the tradition of centuries. Its form was even specified in a Council of Florence document, from the Bull *Exultate Deo*, 11/22/1439. (Denzinger 701) The sole reason to specify it was for the information of the Armenians, but the specification was Church doctrine, unchallenged for centuries, not necessarily subject to change.

But when Pius XII changed it, unnecessarily, all the little sheep accepted his change (though the words and ceremony remained—by papal order—in the rite unchanged), and allowed that he could change it because, since it was written not to the entire Church but only to Armenians, it could not be an infallible statement. Some even thanked Pius for straightening them out. But Pius’ correction was not infallible because it was written, not for the entire Church but for the Latin Rite only.

But one thing it achieved: it set a precedent, by which an occupant of the Holy See could correct his predecessors in doctrine and morals—in violation of his papal oath? Did this precedent somehow justify his butchery of Holy Week (thus setting another precedent) as it pertained to the legally protected traditional Missal?

Or was some one working behind his back? Some one had assumed authority to institute the Easter Vigil, which left us without a Holy Saturday Mass and all its ceremonies. But we could gather in the evening and choke on lighted candles and hope no one’s overcoat would catch fire, while we stood interminably, solemnly repeating our Baptismal vows, an essential ceremony if ever there was one.

As we edged into the late evening Mass we were informed that it would satisfy our Easter Sunday obligation! **How?**

Easter is the greatest Feast of the year. Our entire religion is based on it essentially. “And if Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain: and your faith is also vain.” wrote St. Paul (I Cor. 15:14). But we can ignore it because we attended synagogue the night before.

\$ociety of \$. Pius X devoted its December, 2005 & January, 2006 Angelus to “proof” of validity of the 1968 episcopal ordination, by Fr. Pierre-Marie, O.P. If the \$ociety wishes to negotiate with the Vatican, this is the recommended course. From its inception it has held the antipopes legitimate and their new mass and sacraments “not *per se* invalid.”

The New Order of “Mass” was imposed to bring everyone “mass” in his own language, so he could understand it. This ridiculous excuse supposedly concealed the fact that our Mass had been stolen and replaced with idolatry. No reason existed to modify the ordination rite except deliberate invalidation. It needed no adaptation or translation for “the benefit of” the ordinary Catholic. It was a once-a-year-in-the-cathedral ceremony, at which comparatively few of the

laity ever assisted. Any innovation whatsoever intruded in violation of the papal oath (no longer sworn) to accept the whole religion from one's predecessor and pass it on unchanged to one's successor. Nothing new is Catholic.

Let us recall the catechism definition of a sacrament: an outward sign, conveying an inward grace, instituted by Jesus Christ. Christ is the source of all grace, and only He can institute a sacrament. Our only safe course is to hold to tradition. When we change anything in the sacramental field we risk invalidating it. When we identify heresy in the 1969 "mass" we must ask how it invaded our official worship.

Some one was responsible, and it is certain that he was not Catholic. Could it have been the man in charge, Hannibal Bugnini? Was he not exiled to Iran (where he eventually hanged himself) when his Freemasonry became too blatant? Was he not teamed with Cardinal Lercaro, the man with the motorcycle clergy, and with Dom Bernard Botte, the man who acquired his liturgical tastes from Dom Beauduin, the prototype liturgical heretic? And who protected their assaults on tradition but that stellar innovator Paul VI, who promulgated at least twelve previously condemned heresies as Catholic Doctrine in his signed approval of decrees and documents of the Second Vatican Council? No mere man can create a sacrament—or attach grace thereto.

In the *Angelus* December article Father Pierre-Marie relates: "The execution of the reform prescribed by the" (incompetent) "Second Vatican Council was entrusted to a new organism, ... the Commission for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy ... The chief artisans of the reform were the 'experts,' ... consultants. ... who sometimes exerted pressure that their superiors did not have the courage to resist. ... It is not normal to leave so much power to experts, even if they are very knowledgeable in their field." (Whence their expertise? In a forbidden field outside their competence as well as that of their conciliar and papal "authority".) "They should have been more closely directed by the hierarchy and checked as regards doctrine.

Our Lord entrusted His Church to bishops, not to 'experts,' and the principal role of the hierarchy is to watch over the orthodoxy of the faith. It comes as no surprise that the result of the Consilium's work was not a happy one for the Church. The reforms reflect the attitudes—and the defects— of the experts."

Pierre-Marie continues: "It should come as no surprise that by giving Dom Botte free rein the result was a ritual that broke with the tradition of the Roman Church."

Three cheers for hostile witnesses!

* * * * *

Pirated from an interview with Dr. Alice Von Hildebrand

I shall never forget the private audience we had with Paul VI just before the end of the Council. ... June 21, 1965. As soon as my husband started pleading with him to condemn the heresies that were rampant, the Pope interrupted him with the words, "Lo scriva, lo scriva." ("Write it down.") A few moments later, for the second time, my husband drew the gravity of the situation to the Pope's attention. Same answer. His Holiness received us standing. It was clear that the Pope was feeling very uncomfortable. The audience lasted only a few minutes. Paul VI immediately gave a sign to his secretary, Fr. Capovilla, to bring us rosaries and medals. We then went back to Florence where my husband wrote a long document (unpublished today) that was delivered to Paul VI just the day before the last session of the Council. It was September 1965. After reading my husband's document, he said to my husband's nephew, Dieter Sattler, who had become the German ambassador to the Holy See, that he had read the document carefully, but that "it was a bit harsh." The reason was obvious: my husband had humbly requested a clear condemnation of heretical statements.

... It is a matter of public record, that Bella Dodd ... the ex-Communist who reconverted to the Church, openly spoke of the Communist Party's deliberate infiltration of agents into the seminaries. She told my husband and me that when she was an active party member, she had dealt with no fewer than four cardinals within the Vatican "who were working for us."

... the Evil One has "conspired" against the Church -- and has always aimed in particular at destroying the mass and sapping belief in the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. ... When Christ said to His apostles at the Last Supper that "one of you will betray me," the apostles were

stunned. Judas had played his hand so artfully that no one suspected him, for a cunning conspirator knows how to cover his tracks with a show of orthodoxy.

The two books I mentioned [before the interview] were published in 1998 and 2000 by an Italian priest, Don Luigi Villa of the diocese of Brescia, who at the request of Padre Pio has devoted many years of his life to the investigation of the possible infiltration of both Freemasons and Communists into the Church. My husband and I met Don Villa in the sixties. He claims that he does not make any statement that he cannot substantiate. When *Paulo Sesto Beato?* (1998) was published the book was sent to every single Italian bishop. None of them acknowledged receipt; none challenged any of Don Villa's claims.

In this book, he relates something that no ecclesiastical authority has refuted or asked to be retracted -- even though he names particular personalities in regard to the incident. It pertains to the rift between Pope Pius XII and then Bishop Montini (the future Paul VI) who was his Undersecretary of State. Pius XII, conscious of the threat of Communism, which in the aftermath of World War II was dominating nearly half of Europe, had prohibited the Vatican staff from dealing with Moscow. To his dismay, he was informed one day through the Bishop of Upsala (Sweden) that his strict order had been contravened. The Pope resisted giving credence to this rumor until he was given incontrovertible evidence that Montini had been corresponding with various Soviet agencies. Meanwhile, Pope Pius XII (as had Pius XI) had been sending priests clandestinely into Russia to give comfort to Catholics behind the Iron Curtain. Every one of them had been systematically arrested, tortured, and either executed or sent to the gulag. Eventually a Vatican mole was discovered: Alighiero Tondi, S.J., who was a close advisor to Montini. Tondi was an agent working for Stalin whose mission was to keep Moscow informed on initiatives such as the sending of priests into the Soviet Union.

Add to this Pope Paul's treatment of Cardinal Mindszenty. Against his will, Mindszenty was ordered by the Vatican to leave Budapest. As most everyone knows, he had escaped the Communists and sought refuge in the American embassy compound. The Pope had given him his solemn promise that he would remain primate of Hungary as long as he lived. When the Cardinal (who had been tortured by the Communists) arrived in Rome, Paul VI embraced him warmly, but then sent him to exile in Vienna. Shortly afterwards, this holy prelate was informed that he had been demoted, and had been replaced by someone acceptable to the Hungarian Communist government. More puzzling, and tragically sad, is the fact that when Mindszenty died, no Church representative was present at his burial.

Another of Don Villa's illustrations of infiltration is one related to him by Cardinal Gagnon. Paul VI had asked Gagnon to head an investigation concerning the infiltration of the Church by powerful enemies. Cardinal Gagnon (at that time Archbishop) accepted this unpleasant task, and compiled a long dossier, rich in worrisome facts. When the work was completed, he requested an audience with Pope Paul in order to deliver personally the manuscript to the Pontiff. This request for a meeting was denied. The Pope sent word that the document should be placed in the offices of the Congregation for the Clergy, specifically in a safe with a double lock. This was done, by the very next day the safe was cracked and the manuscript mysteriously vanished.

The usual policy of the Vatican is to make sure the news of such incidents never sees the light of day. Nevertheless, this theft was reported even in *L'Osservatore Romano* (perhaps under pressure because it had been reported in the secular press). Cardinal Gagnon, of course, had a copy, and once again asked the Pope for a private audience. Once again his request was denied. He then decided to leave Rome and return to Canada. Later, he was recalled to Rome by Pope John Paul II and made a cardinal.

... when several bishops pushed for beatification of Paul VI, [Don Villa] perceived it as a clarion call to print the information he had gathered through the years. In so doing, he was following the guidelines of a Roman Congregation, informing the faithful that it was their duty as members of the Church to relay to the Congregation any information that might militate against the candidate's beatification.

Considering the tumultuous pontificate of Paul VI, and the confusing signals he gave, e.g.: speaking about the "smoke of Satan that had entered the Church," yet refusing to condemn heresies officially; his promulgation of *Humanae Vitae* ... yet his careful avoidance of proclaiming it *ex cathedra*; delivering his Credo of the People of God in Piazza San Pietro in 1968, and once again failing to declare it binding on all Catholics; disobeying the strict orders of

Pius XII to have no contact with Moscow, and appeasing the Hungarian Communist government by renegeing on the solemn promise he had made to Cardinal Mindszenty; his treatment of holy Cardinal Slipyj, who had spent seventeen years in a Gulag, only to be made a virtual prisoner in the Vatican by Paul VI; and finally asking Archbishop Gagnon to investigate possible infiltration in the Vatican, only to refuse him an audience when his work was completed — all these speak strongly against the beatification of Paolo VI ...

Doubtless the duty to publish this information was onerous and cost Don Villa great sorrow. Any Catholic rejoices to look up to a Pope with boundless veneration. But even though Christ never promised to give us perfect leaders, He did promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail. Even though the Church has had some very bad popes, and some mediocre ones, she has been blessed with many great popes; eighty have been canonized and several beatified. This is a success story that does not bear parallel in the secular world. God alone is the judge of Paul VI. But it cannot be denied that his pontificate was a very complex and tragic one. It was under him that, in the course of fifteen years, more changes were introduced in the Church than in all preceding centuries combined. What is worrisome is that we read the testimony of ex-Communists like Bella Dodd, and study Freemasonic documents (dating from the nineteenth century, and usually penned by fallen-away priests like Paul Roca), we can see that to a large extent, their agenda has been carried out: the exodus of priests and nuns after Vatican II, dissenting theologians not censured, feminism, the pressure put on Rome to abolish priestly celibacy, immorality in the clergy, blasphemous liturgies (see articles by David Hart in *First Things*, April 2001, “The Future of the Papacy”), the radical changes that have been introduced into the sacred liturgy (see Cardinal Ratzinger's book *Milestones*, pp. 126 and 148, Ignatius Press), and a misleading ecumenism. Only a blind person could deny that many of the Enemy's plans have been perfectly carried out.

* * * * *

The Church at the Turning Points of History, Godfrey Kurth
(1847-1916) Chapter V, **The Church and Neo-Cesarism** (cut)

When Pope Boniface VIII ascended the Pontifical throne (1294), his dream was to remedy the terrible situation by re- establishing peace among all Christian princes and by obtaining from them a new expedition to the Holy Land. To bring this about it was absolutely necessary to prevent the war which seemed imminent between the King of France, Philip the Fair, and the King of England, Edward the First. This wicked war threatened to kindle a conflagration throughout all Europe. The Pope intervened. Giving in to the entreaties of the Pope, and perhaps also to the voice of their Christian conscience, the two rivals agreed to sign a truce of one year, to expire June 24, 1296. April 13, 1296. The Pope, of his own authority, renewed the truce for two years, and imposed it under pain of excommunication.

Philip the Fair protested against the bull. Philip's principles were those which the Popes had opposed and defeated in their struggle against the Hohenstaufen; a great number of historians, persuade themselves with a naiveté almost ludicrous, that these royal absolutist theories are Catholic

theories. Which is more astounding, the credulity of those who believe it or the audacity of those who circulate it? The Pope represented the Catholic tradition of Europe, the King the revolutionary aspirations of his jurists steeped in imperial Roman law.

The Pope took steps to convene a council in Rome to adopt measures to meet the situation. He addressed the tyrant himself in the bull *Ausculta fili*. To these legitimate measures, the King prompted by his jurists, replied with unheard of violence and deceit. He convened the States-General of France, had read to them a false papal bull, made up by his men-of-law, in which they attributed haughty and scornful language to the Roman Pontiff, ordered a jurist to read an insulting reply to the Pope, and obtained from the deceived and terrorized States-General a bill of indemnity for his conduct towards the Pope.

The Pope fulminated the bull *Unam Sanctam*, a solemn and moderate exposition of the pure Catholic doctrine on the relations between the two powers, in accordance with the tradition of the Church, such as might have been formulated by Gregory VII, Alexander III, or Innocent III. At the time he prepared the excommunication of the prevaricating King.

Then Philip the Fair decided to make his final stroke. Surpassing all his past crimes, he

dispatched to Italy one of the vilest insulters of the Pope, William of Nogaret, with the mission to instigate a plot against the Holy See. The wretch, after having endeavored to shake the fidelity of the Roman people, set out for Anagni, where Boniface was without defense. He imprisoned the Pope. The third day the people of Anagni drove out the captors.

The absolutism of kings has broken the equilibrium of the social body, concentrated all the life in the head, atrophied free institutions and made revolution the only possible corrective of tyranny.

How do relations between powers affect baptism of desire?

* * * * *

Archbishop Malcolm Ranjith

Liturgy: The Splendour of Heaven on Earth Lecture at the University of Vienna 19 th or 20th May 2008 The liturgy truly is the exercise of the priestly office of Jesus. It is not something that we humans create on our own. The Church, as a totality, which St. Paul defines the Mystical Body of Christ, in and through its invisible head, Christ, renders its praise and worship to God, in the Communion of the Saints and Angels in heaven.

The liturgy, then, is the action of Christ realized in the Church, which far surpasses all limits of space, time and human understanding and thus is not subject to arbitrary creativity of any sort. Because, it is, in the end analysis, the action of Christ, it is surrounded by an aura of mysticism and mystery. For this same reason it is sacred, universal, even metacosmic and heavenly.

Thus what happens in the Liturgy far surpasses all limitations of space and time and human understanding. It is not something that our mental or sociological categories can limit to this or that action, gesture or interpretation as we would wish to. This is specially so, because it is Christ's own and thus "Given" and not created by man. St. Paul did state so when he explained the Eucharist. Writing to the Corinthians he assured us that what he received from the Lord was what he handed over [1 Cor. 11: 23]. Nothing was of his own making.

The liturgy then as the earthly reflection of the sublime and heavenly sanctifying mission of Christ cannot be left to the whims and fancies of individual or even communitarian creativity. It is Christ who is the main protagonist not the Bishop, priest or individual Catholic nor any given ecclesial community. An anthropocentric outlook on the Liturgy then, is out of place and would just end up causing much confusion and disorder. Man is not the creator of divine action. On the contrary, he is required to tune himself in, so to say, with the requirements of God's redemptive will and its celebrative realization in life. Else, the ancient temptation of wanting "**to be like Gods**" [Gen. 3: 5] would overtake him. And every attempt to feel oneself at the centre of what happens in the celebration of the sublime mysteries, the temptation facing many priests and liturgists today, would vitiate the very nature of the liturgy not only causing much confusion but also emptying it of its inner dynamism. The end result would be liturgy becoming tasteless and a big bore. Why with all this spirit of experimenting and creativity the number of Sunday Mass goers has fallen rapidly in some areas is a question to be faced with courage.

We must never ignore the fact that one of the greatest temptations of humanity today is to "**play God**" and even ecclesiastics are not exempt from this. In fact, faithfulness to the sense of the supernatural and the sacred as well as reverence to the sense of the "**tremendum**" and the "**mysterium**" in liturgical action calls for an attitude of humility and a feeling of unworthiness on the part of those chosen to lead the different celebrations. It is this same sense of "**humility**" that should lead us to respect even more the norms and rubrics of the different liturgical celebrations.

Speaking of the Eucharist Pope Benedict states "**since the Eucharistic liturgy is essentially an actio Dei which draws us into Christ through the Holy Spirit, its basic structure is not something within our power to change nor can it be held hostage by the latest trends**" [Sac. Carit. 37].

Relativism in philosophy and theology is harmful enough to human happiness and spiritual bliss but when it is applied to the liturgy, the effects are disastrous.

Thus a sense of openness and respect towards the hidden and mystical action of Christ in the Church as a whole, especially among the simple faithful, should characterize every attempt at understanding its liturgical life and an attitude of fear and reverence towards it should accompany any attempt at changing or improving its liturgical praxis. One must not hasten to or

let one's capacity for mental acrobacy run amok in this. Liturgists and pastors need to be cautious and let time and the community's sense of faith guide them. A good liturgist is one who is in tune with the Church. One cannot give up or change the norms or the structure of a liturgical celebration just by reason of a personal illumination. And in no way could a celebrating priest decide on a **"do it yourself liturgy"**. Such an attitude is arrogant and highly disrespectful not only of the traditions of the Church but of the faith of the simple which demands respect. It is not too infrequently that we at the Congregation in Rome hear not only of ad hoc changes tried out by individual priests contrary to the spirit of the norms and rubrics of the Sacred Liturgy day in and day out but also of actions highly offensive to the faith of the **"simple ones"** without even a minimum of preparation or consultation.

And when this happens at the arbitrary will of persons in whom the Lord has placed great trust inviting them to represent Him in the celebration of the Sacred Mysteries, it is shocking indeed. We must not forget that prayer of Jesus – **"I bless you father, Lord of heaven and earth, for hiding these things from the learned and the clever and revealing them to mere children"** [Mt. 11: 25]. When the faith of the simple is put to the test in this manner by individuals who wish to **"play God"** it is indeed a scandal. No one, and in the least a priest can change at will the liturgical rubrics of the Church [S.C. 22: 1 - 3]. The cost for the Church is high if her prayer life, which is indeed a reflection of its faith, is tinkered with, in this manner.

Thus the often quoted fact that because Jesus is supposed to have faced the apostles at the last supper the priest should face the people at the Eucharist turns out to be a fallacy and an oversimplification. A slavish desire to ape an arbitrary interpretation of putative liturgical practices of **"the early years"** is thus to be shunned on the whole. One of the greatest damages that has been done to the liturgy of late has been the sense of confusion allowed into the sanctuary and the nave with the removal of that essential distinction. Symbolically the altar rails have been removed in many churches, priests are doing what the laity has to do and the laity the other way. Too many people walk around the altar; there is much distraction and disturbance. It is like a theatre and truly enough the priest is no more **"the anonymous go-between, the first among the faithful, facing God and not the people, representative of all and together with them offering the sacrifice, while reciting prayers that have been prescribed for him – today he is a distinct person, with personal characteristic, his personal life style, his face turned towards the people. For many priests this change is a temptation they cannot handle, ... to them, the level of success of their personal power and thus the indicator of their feeling of personal security and self assurance"** [K. G. Rey, Pubertäterscheinungen in der Katholischen Kirche (Kritische Texte, 4), Köln: Benzinger, 1970, p. 25]. The priest here becomes the main actor playing out a drama with other actors on the altar and the more dramatic and sensational they all become they feel that they are performing well. The central role of Christ fades away in such a scenario. This is not something the Council wanted. Nowhere is there an indication that it wanted to clericalise the laity and laicise the clergy in the way it seems to be happening in many areas. I have sought to raise all these issues which I consider so central to a faithful and noble celebration of Liturgy hoping only to stimulate fresh thinking.

It is not a question of the so-called "Tridentine" Mass as against the Mass of Pope Paul VI. The Missal promulgated after the Council of Trent itself was not something that came *ex-novo*. It was the Missal of the Roman Curia which had come into existence several centuries prior to Trent. Pope Pius V had only re-touched it minimally and approved it. It contains traditions that go back to the time of Pope Damasus [366 – 384 AD] and even earlier. Subsequently it was further enriched by the introduction of the new Holy Week Liturgy by Pope Pius XII. [See our comment on page 2 of this issue, lower left and upper right columns.] Pope John XXIII too made a new ordering of the rubrics. One cannot totally abandon that long tradition and go for a so called new liturgy. Even if the Council were to indicate guidelines such need not have been implemented immediately, totally and exactly as it was written. But even this was not so as we saw earlier. In any case, there was the greater obligation of the *salus animarum* which should have been the *suprema lex* in these matters. Quite a number of changes introduced were well intentioned and meaningful but others not so or were hastily done and still others ideologically coloured and forced into the Liturgy.

Bi-millennial traditions are not given up in a few months or a few years just because a panel of experts, even the best ones, deemed such necessary. If changes needed to be done they should have been studied in detail, reflected much, discussed and debated and in all of this a sense of reverent respect towards the sacred and the mystical realities should have been maintained.

[These excerpts sound great, but would sound greater if there were properly ordained priests available to celebrate the true Mass.]

* * * * *

One Sunday in June, after Mass, I met a conservative Catholic who had heard my name twenty years ago, but had heard also that I was a sedevacantist. This I enthusiastically admitted, immediately pointing out that my odd point of view saves me time and energy baptizing or clarifying into semblance of orthodoxy the indefensible multiple heresies issuing regularly and cumulatively from five consecutive “infallible” usurpers of the obviously vacant Roman See. Obviously vacant? For nineteen centuries the pope was our standard of unity. These last five not only fail to agree with all genuine popes until 1958, often enough they oppose each other. This is only natural; each professedly continues to implement, as he gets to them, the decrees and documents of the Second Vatican Council. He must implement them because unless and until he does, they are not in effect. By definition each implementation is an innovation. *Nothing new is Catholic.*

Until that disastrous council, all Catholics believed the same. I recall a discussion in the early 1970’s among four Catholics. One thought the discussion useless; all we needed was acceptance of the changes imposed by the experts in charge. The rest expressed widely differing views, but we settled nothing, except that three Catholics each considered the other two heretics. Had there been a standard of unity (a pope) we would have agreed, and the discussion would never have happened. Things have raced downhill since.

No pope? Two public heretics in succession had usurped the office, in defiance of reason and law. Between them they killed the missionary effort, for the continuation of which Jesus Christ promised to remain all days with His Church.

We draw further comfort from the utter irrelevance of recent criticisms of “the sedevacantist enterprise.” But let us note in passing that defenders of papal status for heretics not only fall automatically into their same heresies, but in practice additionally deny papal infallibility: “A pope can teach error in faith and morals!”

* * * * *

Excommunicated, ineligible Usurper Joseph Ratzinger, now known as Benedict XVI: “Eucharistic devotion such as is noted in the silent visit by the devout in church must not be thought of as a conversation with God. This would assume that God was present there locally and in a confined way. To justify such an assertion shows a lack of understanding of the Christological mysteries of the very concept of God. This is repugnant to the serious thinking of the man who knows about the omnipresence of God. To go to church on the ground that one can visit God Who is present there is a senseless act which the modern man rightfully rejects.” (Joseph Ratzinger, “Die Sakramentale Begründung Christlicher Existenz,” The Sacramental Reason for Christian Existence, 1966, Kyrios Publishing, Freising-Meitingen, Germany).

The Council of Trent: “... that after the consecration of bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true man, is truly, really and substantially contained in the august sacrament of the Holy Eucharist under the appearance of those sensible things (bread and wine)” (Session XIII, Chapter I, The Real Presence of our Lord Jesus Christ in the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist).

“There is, therefore, no room for doubt that all the faithful of Christ may, in accordance with a custom always received in the Catholic Church, give to this most holy sacrament in veneration the worship of *latría*, which is due to the true God” (Ch. V).

“But since Christ our Redeemer declared that to be truly His own body which He offered under the form of bread, it has, therefore, always been a firm belief in the Church of God, and this holy council now declares it anew, that by the `consecration of the bread and wine a change is brought

about of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood. This change the holy Catholic Church properly and appropriately calls transubstantiation” (Chapter IV).

“If anyone denies that in the sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist are contained truly, really and substantially the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ, but says that He is in it only as in a sign, or figure or force, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA” (Canons on the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, Canon 1). [Imperial Rome provided bread and circuses. New Rome has us bring our own bread.] Ratzinger’s Visitation has had an effect on U.S. Church, according to the Knights of Columbus periodical Columbia, July 2008, which bases its conclusion upon a KC-commissioned poll of 1,013 [Catholic?] adults run by the Marist College Institute for Public Opinion between April 22-24.

Fortuitously, the same group had conducted a poll in March, presumably of the same adults, before the circus, to provide figures for comparison. Sure enough Benedict’s rating as both spiritual and world leader, really vital statistics, climbed 8% (practicing Catholics) and 17% (non-practicing) and 13% (practicing) and 25% (non-practicing) respectively. We are not told how many practice. As an interfaith leader (relevant to Catholics?) he jumped 19% and 28%. Status as a concerned leader brought him 10% more appreciation from practicers and 30% more from slackers. Overall 10% more take a more positive view of their world traveler.

Resulting from his trip, says the poll, of U.S. Catholics: 66% more are likelier to appreciate membership in the Church; half intend to enlarge the family’s importance in their life, which they will lead more morally; 45% now intend to attend religious services (Catholic?); 41% plan to vote in November’s elections; 39% will become more active in their community; 38% will become more active in the Church; 33% will now contribute money to the Church; and 73% have a positive view of the Knights of Columbus. What more can be desired? Especially after enduring the

Supreme Chaplain’s Reflections:

“... we met a humble man blessed with brilliant faith [in the Real Presence?] and penetrating intellectual powers [who] connected to people of all ages and backgrounds [except traditional] — with the cheering crowds at Nationals Park and Yankee Stadium; with the exuberant young people at St. Joseph Seminary in Yonkers; with mourners at Ground Zero; with the victims of abuse [to which he has turned a blind eye]; and with bishops, priests, religious, seminarians and educators. [He] described the foundations of ecumenism and entered into respectful dialogue with inter-religious leaders, dramatized by the first-ever visit of a pope to a U.S. synagogue. He offered world leaders a sound rationale for the United Nations [a truly amazing first!] and brilliantly outlined its role for our changing world” [which requires a changing Church]. [He] “bore witness to the light of truth that generates freedom and love ... challenged us to be agents of generous love and unity in the Church and society. He challenged us to bring the vision of faith to bear on society’s problems [largely created by the disastrous failure of his new Church] and to join together in a world of love and hope—a world where the rights and dignity of each per[vert] are respected. ...

“It is up to us to build upon the gift of this papal visit [security for which cost the taxpayer an unconscionable sum]. It is for us to ponder [his] words; to be renewed in our life of prayer, both private and liturgical; to grow in our knowledge and love of what our faith teaches [in new catechisms]; and to be men and women of intense charity [a divine virtue directed first to God, and for His sake to others], not only for those we already know and love but also for those whom we may never meet but who need our love and help.”

In almost verbatim agreement we find on page 3 Supreme Knight Carl A. Anderson, who bravely accepts and imposes the challenge:

“Pope Benedict has offered us a great opportunity for the renewal of the Church, and it is the responsibility of every Knight to accept and act upon this great gift to help build up the Church.”
[What happened to Vatican II’s Renewal?]

“Bishop” Lori and Mr. Anderson have obviously conversed with Ratzinger, the most dangerous heretic and traitor at the Second Vatican Council. “Never talk with Ratzinger,” Elizabeth Gerstner warned. “He will talk you into anything.” He charms away righteous objections. He promises redress. He can sell a used pyramid, and another jackass to help climb it. He has created immense chaos; and now that he is in position to resolve it, he sticks his victims with responsibility to recover order—the order we kept for nineteen centuries. We, bereft of the ordinary means of salvation, are to save the world. Our present crisis is by far the worst. Heretics and apostates have taken charge, and most people who think they are Catholic have no idea of Catholic doctrine and morals, having learned neither from the destroyers in charge, from their pulpits, or from their schools in the last forty years..

(Questions the KC might ask the clergy.)

Why has the Church imposed a man-made liturgy, which predictably alienated millions from attendance?

Why has the Church imposed wretched vernacular translations which predictably have destroyed the Latin Rite’s unity?

Why has the Church imposed a new Ecumenism, which abandons the missionary effort in favor of dialogue with all kinds of organized heretics who have left us?

Why has the Church joined with the rest of mankind in the search for the truth which we received from Jesus Christ and His Apostles? [Gaudium et Spes (Church in the Modern World) tells us, contrary to all ages of Catholic teaching, that (16) “Christians are joined with the rest of men in the SEARCH for truth,” rather than differentiated from the rest of men by its possession.]

Why has the Second Vatican Council declared that Jesus Christ brought His Revelation to completion on the Cross? [Vatican II (Declaration on Religious Freedom, 11): “In the end, when He completed on the Cross the work of redemption whereby He achieved salvation and true freedom for man, He also brought His revelation to completion.”]

[This bald statement, unmodified by context, is unnecessary in and unrelated to context. It is either incredible stupidity or devious purpose. It contradicts Christ Himself at the Last Supper: “I have yet many things to say to you but you cannot bear them now.” (John xvi, 12) It removes from His revelation (1) His resurrection, (2) His explanation of His fulfilment of the prophecies, (3) His establishment of the sacrament of Penance, (4) St. Thomas’ skepticism and its dissipation, (5) John xxi, 15-17 (Feed My sheep), used to establish the primacy of St. Peter and the papacy, (6) His mandate and mission to His Church, (7) His Ascension, and (8) the descent of the Holy Ghost. Choosing revelation is heresy.]

What has happened to the papal oath by which a new pope swears to accept the entire body of dogma and morals from his predecessor and to pass it on unchanged to his successor? Given the fact that popes were required to take this oath for centuries, whence comes a pope’s authority and competence to impose or allow change in official worship and /or forms and matter of sacraments, by definition instituted by Jesus Christ?

Given the fact that Jesus Christ gave us a complete, perfect, unchangeable Revelation, why has the Catholic Church issued or adopted new catechisms such as the official Catechism of the Catholic Church which contains by line count twenty-five per cent dogmatic and moral material never taught anywhere in the Catholic Church before the Second Vatican Council?

Given the fact that all our canon laws are written in Latin and all our dogmas are defined in Latin, why has the study of the Latin language been made optional in nearly all Latin rite seminaries? How can a priest function in ignorance of the Church’s official language?

* * * * *

Health Tip chiefly for Australians

Beware the MarSupial Glucomout (MSG) virus, which is nearly always transmitted to humans in the same manner as Anthrax, by inoculation with the live virus for the avowed purpose of preventing its outbreak. We cannot, however, rule out normal ingestion of minced wallaby. Symptoms include hyperactive proboscidal hirsutation combined with abnormal curiosity, inability to retain or process simple, factual information, rejection of glucose compounds, a tendency to undermine tall buildings at a single leap, and general (wom)battiness.

Treatment is protracted and expensive, but optional. Most sufferers never realize that they harbor the virus, and seem as happy as if in their right minds. In fact, some will tell you they are of two minds (even three, occasionally) on the subject, whatever it may be—and sometimes is.

The main thing is not to worry. Normalcy, difficult enough to define, smacks of the remote past. The patient need not concern himself with how far off base he is, because debasement has replaced normalcy, and now constitutes an acceptable substitute for stability—which is, as all know, essential to sanity?

Meanwhile we can offer our special beak razor, complete with detachable rake. Must be seen to be appreciated.

Clinics scheduled shortly at Ayers Rock, third excavation to the left, the lo-o-o-ong tunnel.

* * * * *

Argument Corner

Objection↓ We read in Apocalypse 21:5. And he that sat on the throne, said: Behold, I make all things new. Why, then, do you insist that nothing new is Catholic?

Reply↓ That promise was recorded late in the first century. Your citation sums up the first four verses. It is all prophecy, and seems to refer to the end of the world. But it is not in itself new. We have had these words for nearly two thousand years; they are part of the immutable Deposit of Faith. These words are all written or spoken in the future tense. We accept them on the authority of the Catholic Church, because the Church guarantees the Bible, which, without the Church's guarantee, is only a book. Nothing guarantees itself.

21:1-4. I saw a new heaven and a new earth. For the first heaven and the first earth was gone: and the sea is now no more. And I, John, saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice from the throne, saying: Behold the tabernacle of God with men: and he will dwell with them. And they shall be his people: and God himself with them shall be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes: and death shall be no more. Nor mourning, nor crying, nor sorrow shall be any more, for the former things are passed away.

The book itself ends with a sanction:

22:18-19. For I testify to every one that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book: If any man shall add to these things, God shall add unto him the plagues written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from these things that are written in this book.

Come back when you find in Scriptural prognostication: Behold, I make all worship and doctrine new.

I see no inconsistency between holding to Divine Revelation and condemning innovations which have never been part thereof. This should be self-evident.

Objection—You keep pushing a discredited religion run by sodomites and pederasts. “By their fruits you shall know them.”

Reply— Our religion, founded by Jesus Christ, is perfect, and can be neither improved nor disgraced by men—for whose salvation it was founded—who from the time of Adam have notoriously fallen short of perfection. We have of late been infiltrated from the top by men who have chosen not to observe the requirements of our perfect religion. It makes no sense to judge a religion by its traitors and failures. We would be only too happy to subject them to Pope St. Pius

V's ordinance that such men be turned over to the secular authority for trial—with virtual certainty of execution. But they participated in codification of the 1917 Code of Canon Law, which omitted this salutary law, enacted for the general good.

We have had failures and traitors in every age. They include such as Arius, Nestorius, Jan Hus, Martin Luther, Henry VIII, John Calvin, Ulrich Zwingli, Thomas Cranmer, Adam Weishaupt, most of the bishops and *periti* at the Second Vatican Council, Angelo Roncalli who convoked it, Montini who promulgated its heretical documents, Albino Luciani, Karol the Koran Kisser, and Joseph Ratzinger, all three of whom continued to implement its innovations, and even one of the original twelve disciples of Jesus Christ, Judas Iscariot.

Objection—So we have a pope who teaches error sometimes. We must listen to him when he is correct. Where else can we find true doctrine? Like Occam's Razor we cut away the error and keep what is true.

Reply—If he teaches error he must teach some truth along with it, or no one will believe he is pope. We are entitled to truth from a pope. If we must pick and choose among his words we are reduced to the definition of heresy. We choose. Nor need we receive God's word from him. None of it is new. He had roughly two hundred sixty trustworthy predecessors to whom we can listen. In the good old days, when heretics were burnt, did Occam's Razor preserve orthodox parts? Or was the whole heretic burnt?

Objection—Why don't you give us a balanced argument? Why don't we hear both sides?

Reply—We tell you the truth. Has error equal rights? If a mathematics professor teaches geometry, must he also demonstrate incorrect propositions? When the Apostles preached, did they bring along a Pharisee to balance their presentations?

Objection—You have stated that the Catholic Church exists on earth as long as one person keeps the faith. But unless this person is a bishop the Church would be defective—neither Catholic nor Apostolic. It could not carry out its missionary effort.

Reply—The Catholic Church existed in Japan without clergy from about 1620 to 1865. It had no identifiable missionary effort. Yet it was persecuted without remission. It must have done something right. As the isolated Japanese Catholics belonged to their invisible Church structure, so we, isolated in time, remain with the Communion of Saints, with all popes, Apostles, and missionaries of the Church.

Queries for clerics (or for interested parties)

Is the postconciliar "Church" different from the Catholic Church of nineteen centuries? Or are they (how) identical?

Before The Second Vatican Council did the Church not have Mass and Sacraments?

Are Mass and Sacraments not divinely instituted?

Who instituted the postconciliar mass and sacraments?

What is the purpose of new mass rites and new sacraments?

To clarify their purposes and put them in the vernacular to accomplish this end.

What is the effect of new mass rites and new sacraments?

To confuse and destroy mass and sacraments. Any change in these matters introduces reasonable and unnecessary doubt. Doubtful sacrament, no sacrament.

Since the purposes have not been achieved, and the effects were predictable, it would seem at least probable that the effects were the true purposes.

Query—Where can we find the official definition of gates of hell?

Reply—This phrase was defined by Pope St. Leo IX in his letter *In terra pax hominibus* to Michael Cerularius, the Byzantine Emperor, and to Leo of Achrida, September 2, 1053. It is contained in Denzinger §351. "Chapter 7 ... The holy Church built upon a rock, that is Christ, and upon Peter or Cephas, the son of John who first was called Simon, because by the gates of Hell, that is, by the *disputations of heretics* which lead the vain to destruction, it would never be overcome; thus Truth itself promises, through whom are true, whatsoever things are true: 'The gates of hell will not prevail against it' [Matt. 16:18]"

Argument Corner (Objections omitted as obvious)

Whether or not *Quo primum tempore* is a Papal Bull, it is the law of the Church, printed in the front of every altar missal. You state that it is not dogma but discipline. How does this exonerate its violators? The “Tridentine Rite” was in use at least during the pontificate of Pope St. Gregory the Great, who first sent missionaries to Britain’s German invaders at the end of the sixth century. When St. Pius V needed a Mass to guarantee in the face of the Protestant Revolt (in which, as now, every priest did his own thing) he used the oldest rite in existence. He codified into ecclesiastical law the very center of Catholicism established by Jesus Christ as Divine Law, the prescription of proper worship which satisfies the Catholic’s divinely imposed obligation — a moral obligation just as much in the field of papal infallibility as dogmatic definition — once established, never to be changed because bound in heaven, i.e., in eternity. St. Pius V changed nothing; he merely promulgated as Church law what Jesus Christ had enjoined — which had bound all popes before and has bound all popes since. What kind of pope forbids divinely prescribed worship?

“What about the Hebrew rite?” What Hebrew rite? Jesus Christ, having celebrated the Passover (probably in Hebrew), immediately supplanted it (probably in Greek or Aramaic) with His Sacrifice of the New Testament. But Montini’s fraudulently imposed new rite has supplanted the traditional offertory with the insufficient offerings of the Old Testament Passover service, thereby reversing and “correcting” Jesus Christ Who had supplanted these insufficient offerings with His own efficacious Sacrifice which looked forward to and included the Crucifixion.

“The words of the Mass are correct.” You must refer to the new Montinian rite. You certainly can’t mean any more than the words of the “narrative of institution,” because the whole rite abounds with incorrect words in both Latin and vernaculars.

Please recall that Luther and Cranmer kept your words, without consecration, transubstantiation, or Mass. And the vernacular version, used almost exclusively despite your “fact” that it is available in Latin, not only “leaves much to be desired” but is absolutely incorrect. If Jesus Christ’s words and actions are needed for consecration, how is it achieved with substitute words? So with no offertory, a replaced consecration, and a priest’s communion merged into the properly separate distribution to the congregation, what remains of your essential parts? Having none of these, how is this new rite a Mass?

“All else can be omitted, etc., without making it invalid.” You are quite simply in most complicated error, as shown by Canons 733 (“In the celebration, administration and reception of the sacraments, the liturgical rites and ceremonies prescribed in the rituals approved by the Church must be accurately observed”), 817 (“It is forbidden, even in urgent, extreme necessity to consecrate either matter without the other, or even both, outside the celebration of Mass?”), and 1261 (“Ordinaries of places must be watchful that the provisions of the sacred canons regarding divine worship be sedulously observed, and especially that, in divine worship whether public or private or in the daily life of the faithful, no superstitious practice be introduced, and that nothing be admitted which is foreign to the faith, or out of harmony with ecclesiastical tradition, or has the appearance of base profit seeking.”) of the Code, and by Canon 2 on Revelation, Vatican Council’s Dogmatic Constitution on the Catholic Faith (“If anyone shall say that it is impossible or inexpedient that man should be taught by the divine revelation concerning God and the worship to be paid to Him; let him be anathema”). Furthermore, the priest acts for the Church, and must intend what the Church intends. He cannot intend what the Church intends at a “black mass,” a Book of Common Prayer service, or the wildcat “consecration” of a bakery, and cannot, therefore, transubstantiate in such environments.

What definition? That in the new rite promulgation — the gathering to celebrate a meal? The new rite itself? But it was introduced as an experiment with Montini’s hopes and wishes. Who needed it, after nineteen centuries of genuine Mass?

Why did Montini lie about obedience to Vatican II in promulgating it? And Wojtyla has said for years that there IS salvation outside the Church, probably because he hopes somehow to be saved.

No pope ever had power to vary the essentials of the Mass, but only to preserve what had been

preserved for him. Mass and sacraments belong solely to their Divine Source, and may not be safely modified, even for some shadow of a reason.

Bugnini's innovation was not Mass, but a rite concocted from heretical sources. Validity? Irrelevant! You have not shown where I disagree with the Church. Nor can you. I am necessarily correct; I have changed nothing.

The Holy Ghost indeed guides the Church. But who guides the mob in Rome today? The Holy Ghost cannot contradict Himself — stand behind Trent and all popes from St. Peter to Pius XII, then change His mind and guarantee Vatican II and its five heretical antipopes.

You want to fight the modernists, but you seem not to realize that they include Roncalli, Montini, Luciani, Wojtyla, Archbp. Gleeson of Adelaide, and every other bishop in the "Church" today. These men usurp Catholic sees, just as the fourth century Arians and the sixteenth century "reformers." We must at least unmask them. Uncharitable?

You think **Time Out Of Mind** insufficiently documented — that nothing is proven. It was written for those unconvinced by the heavily documented **Paul VI's Legacy: Catholicism?** — "over their heads."

Twice you've written that my argument is based solely on *Quo primum*. Why this absurd insistence? Can't you appreciate or reply to the rest? I find Vatican II illegally convoked, and quoted in previously condemned heresies promulgated over Paul VI's signature. I cite Canon Laws which state that public heresy places a man outside the Catholic Church by the very fact of deficient faith, and denies him all office in that Church to which he cannot belong. I cite Montini's own definition of his new order, which is why it belongs to a new order. He even stole the meaning (ordinary of the Mass) to apply the word to a massively defective worship shot through with heresies. Even a real pope could not have acted so far beyond his competence. Popes have no power over the substance of the sacraments. Popes cannot introduce new rites of Mass and have never done so. All this would apply even without the fact of *Quo primum*, an infallible statement in the moral order, to be ranked with the first three of the Ten Commandments. Its violation has led to their gross violation. Even a pope is subject to Divine Law. Look around and apply the divine test: "By their fruits you shall know them."

(Back to Objections)

Objection—You have not, after their deaths, exposed Walter Matt and Michael Davies as tremendous neutralizers. You commit a serious sin of omission unless you unmask these two bums.

Reply — I opposed some of their opinions and actions while they lived. I was disgusted with some of their stances, and I specified many of the points on which we differed. Why must I continue to call attention to their inability to come to logical conclusions on readily available evidence? How often must I repeat myself? No one who reads my publications has any doubt that my stance on sedevacantism opposes theirs. I need not pound on them every issue of my periodical, particularly since they have advanced no new arguments since they died. Lefebvre fits a different frame; he has left behind an active organization of swindling schismatics, who continue to push increasingly strange and innovative ideas, which I combat as soon as I discover them. I never identify most opponents; I attack their ideas, not their persons.

In checking my computer files I find that I have never publicly attacked that heretical phony priest, "Father" John Martinez ("ordained" 20 December 1970 in Guatemala) of Frederick, Oklahoma. The only reference to him is contained in a reply to an inquiry from a subscriber: "I received your copy of a publication called Catholic, committed to paper by a man who should be committed to an insane asylum. He had not enough to fill all his pages, but accomplished this by useless repetition. He is a perennial liar, trouble-maker, heretic, false priest, who provides 'mass' and 'sacraments' just as he were a properly ordained priest. This provides those who assist at his phony 'mass' with plenty of opportunity to commit the first and greatest sin on the calendar, idolatry!

"A woman in Texas argued a few years ago that 'Father' John Martinez is a true priest, and to prove this lie she sent me a copy of the rite used to 'ordain' him in Guatemala. It proves, however, that he underwent a new man-made 'sacrament' promulgated the same day as the *novus ordo* 'mass'" Neither the 'mass' nor the 'sacrament' is or ever was valid. Both are man-made, therefore incapable of producing grace.

“The whole problem that he so incompetently and irreverently raised is covered in the enclosed book, *The Enemy is Still Here!*, pages 129 to 175. All the articles I have written on this irrelevant subject can be found on those pages. I say irrelevant because no one who currently argues the subject is not baptized. It is a matter solely in God’s hands and need concern none of us. Its current use is as an instrument to split traditional Catholics.”

I retain several copies of the aforementioned “ordination” rite by which “Father” Vincent John Martinez was swindled in the cathedral of Huehuetenango well over a year after the introduction of the Montini-Bugnini novus ordination. The argument used to validate the rite was that the English translation of the Spanish rite contained the word *priesthood* —not *presbyterate*; therefore the bishop had the intention (not specified in the rite) of ordaining a priest—not an elder.

Objection—In *The War Is Now!* # 61 you quote Joseph Pohle, S.T.D.: “In like manner Mass may be celebrated privately for the souls of deceased Jews and heathens, who have led an upright life, since the sacrifice is intended to benefit all who are in purgatory.” This is pure modernism, and implies that a Jew or heathen who has led an upright life but died outside the Body of Christ on earth could be in Purgatory.

Reply—Our three great condemnations of modernism, Pius IX’s *Syllabus of Errors* and St. Pius X’s *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* and *Lamentabili sane*, appear to refer in no way to your highlighted “pure modernism.” I can appreciate that Leonard Feeney might have difficulty in reconciling Joseph Pohle’s implication with his own views. Naturally, if no Jew or heathen can be saved, then neither can be in Purgatory. But Pohle had never encountered Feeney’s subsequent innovation, and therefore took no cognizance of it. He wrote for **The Catholic Encyclopedia**, which carries Cardinal Farley’s *imprimatur*.

I cite a standard seminary textbook first published in 1877, Nicholas Gihl’s *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*, pp. 187- 8: to represent the latter application as permissible. But this distinction has no foundation in the law, and, therefore, appears unreliable (*Ubi lex non distinguit, neque nos distinguere debemus* — Where the law makes no distinction, neither ought we).

The opinion of the lawfulness of applying the Mass in this case is, therefore, at least doubtful. The Church has prohibited every special application of the Mass and its celebration for deceased non-Catholics for weighty reasons; therefore she is not responsible for the injury that the separation from her visible communion may have entailed even beyond the tomb. As to the rest, deceased non-Catholics are not totally deprived of the blessed influence of the Mass; for prayers and the Mass also are offered in general for them, and when Mass is celebrated for all the suffering souls, they also derive advantage therefrom.”

(It appears from this that some not externally united with the Church can be in Purgatory. If in Purgatory, they belong to the Church Suffering, which is part of the Communion of Saints.) Before the rot set in we often heard Mass announced “for the intention of John Doe.” I would bet that often the priest himself did not know the intention.

The Catholic Encyclopedia (1913), Vol IV, p.656a: those of the dead for whom private prayers may be offered—except that they may not be offered formally either for the blessed in heaven or for the damned. Not only for the faithful who have died in external communion with the Church, but for deceased non-Catholics, even the unbaptized, who may have died in the state of grace, one is free to offer his personal prayers and good works; nor does the Church’s prohibition of her public offices for those who have died out of external communion with her affect the strictly personal element in her minister’s acts. For all such she prohibits the public offering of the Sacrifice of the Mass (and of other liturgical offices); but theologians commonly teach that a priest is not forbidden to offer the Mass in private for the repose of the soul of any one who, judging by probable evidence, may be presumed to have died in faith and grace, provided, at least, he does not say the special requiem Mass with the special prayer in which the deceased is named, since this would give the offering a public and official character.” – Patrick J. Toner,

D.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth

Objection—The Church never prays for martyrs. Prayer for martyrs is considered an insult. Martyr is Greek for witness. The Church maintains a list, the Martyrology, of those whose witness has directly resulted in death at the hands of persecutors. But are there not others who would have died for Jesus Christ and His Church, whose lives were one long persecution for the same reasons, but who survived until God took them? Look, for example, at Father Oswald Baker, who died July 2, 2004, two months into his ninetieth year at Downham Market, Norfolk, where he had held out against the Great Renewal from its inception. He lived and died for Jesus Christ and His Church. Despite all official discouragement and “removal,” he stood where he had been assigned, and cared for the needs of his parish. He would not acknowledge the authority of apostates. For him the usurpers were not Popes but Nopes. Their crowd may not have taken his life, but they took his living. Would it not constitute an insult to pray for him?

Reply—While I incline to agree with your point of view, I believe, with all railroad men, that the safe course should be taken. Let us not grant him the privileges of martyrdom if God has not. In the Communion of Saints we owe him what our prayers may do for him. We have no way of knowing if he tinted his toenails or cheated at solitaire. He never abandoned us. Let us never abandon him. Let us thank God that we had a real priest all these years. With half a dozen like him in each diocese we would have beaten the official apostasy. If, as you think, he needs no prayers, let us pray anyway. If we are thankful enough for Father Baker, God may favor more priests with the same spirit.

Objection—The ICEL translation of the consecration of the chalice, ending: “shed for you and for all” is, Omlor says, invalid for two reasons: 1. Mistranslation of for you and for many; 2. This mistranslation changes the form's essential sense. But these are not invalidating change in the form.

Reply—Who has a right to mistranslate Christ's words? The essential form of consecration cannot produce its proper effect in a rite which declares incompatible intention. The *novus ordo* clearly states what it offers, the work of human hands, the produce of the earth, even the people themselves, ALL of them. Its “consecration” is a narrative, not an action accompanied by blessing and prayer as required by all proper rites to do what Christ did, not merely quote Him. This change is obvious even in the punctuation. Both points were cited in the *Ottaviani Intervention*, which Paul VI had the temerity to ignore, and which responded to the original Latin version of the *novus ordo missae*.

Your argument that transubstantiation is effected by **This is the chalice of My blood** is rendered irrelevant by the fact that the entire formula was used by Jesus Christ and followed by His words: “As often as ye shall do these things ye shall do them in memory of Me.” He, all the ages' clearest Speaker, prescribed the entire formula in the most specific, most solemn act of His life.

The Church has always followed His instructions. In the Missal itself, *De Defectibus, Cap. V, Formae*, after full quotation of both consecration formulae: “If anyone removes or changes anything in the form of consecration of the Body and Blood, and by this change of words does not signify the same thing as these words do, he does not confect the sacrament.”—a statement of plain fact. Facts are not subject to revision by law-givers.

What is essential in addition to make the essential form operative has never, supposedly, been defined because the subject has never surfaced. Priests have adhered to their Missals. But *De Defectibus* (III 5, 6, 7; IV 3, 4; X 3, 13) implies additional essentials through prescription of where the priest must start over in certain types of defects. Canon Law (817) forbids even these essentials outside of Mass. Canon Law, therefore, does not consider the Consecration sufficient by itself. Unlike the innovators, Canon Law would not forbid proper worship.

“To consecrate outside the Mass would not only be a sacrilege, but probably also an attempt at invalid consecration. The priest would certainly not perform that action in the person of Christ, nor according to the intention of the Church, which is restricted to the celebration of the Mass.”—C. Augustine, OSB, DD, “A Commentary on Canon Law” (1921)

Quo Primum, the specific law the new rite violates, was promulgated when necessary to preserve the Mass from the first serious threat in centuries, the Reformation, by a pope invoking his Apostolic authority on a matter of faith and morals to the entire Church. It is therefore an infallible pronouncement made to add the support of specific ecclesiastical law to divine law being violated. It was proclaimed with just such abuses as this new rite in view. Divine law cannot be removed or over-ruled, whether or not supported by other law.

The point at issue is not what may or may not be the doctrine of the Church, but what words Christ used to effect the Consecration. If we stray from His words we run the clear hazard of straying from His effect, because the Consecration is effected by the words of Christ. All rites in use—Oriental, schismatic, heretic—in any language (even English in the Church of England) agree on for many; none but our *novus ordo* in the vernaculars has ever used for all men.

“.... Ritual and Rubrics are not in themselves a matter of dogmatic definition,” said Paul VI, 19 Nov. 1969. Here, as in promulgating the *novus ordo missae*, he dodges. He conveys that he does not intend to speak *ex cathedra*—infallibly.

“Ritual and rubrics” insufficiently describes his new rite. His use of “derogation to the extent necessary” and “Apostolic Constitutions issued by our predecessors” (new “mass” promulgation) is designed to be interpreted as effective abrogation of *Quo Primum*, which is not subject to abrogation. He never suggests the probability that our Holy Mass—and even more the introduction of a new rite—fall under moral definition, also within the scope of infallibility.

But why had a man who traded so heavily on imputation of infallibility to his every act and “wish” not claimed infallibility for his promulgation of the *novus ordo*? Because he could then never deny infallibility to St. Pius V’s proclamation, *Quo Primum*, which covered the same moral ground without innovation.

Consider the manner of the 1570 Missal’s promulgation as the standard. A pope (since canonized) appealing to his Apostolic Authority and speaking to the whole Church on a matter of faith (verbal content and effect of the Mass) and morals (the Mass is our highest moral act, performed in accordance with God’s First and Third Commandments, concerned entirely with morals). This Bull, then, bears all the earmarks of an infallible statement. It is at least four centuries’ teaching of the Supreme Magisterium.

The *novus ordo* was introduced by the “wish” and “hope” of Paul VI in “obedience” (not owed!) to Vatican II in a promulgation which could not abrogate *Quo Primum*. The avowed purpose of the new rite was to make our worship acceptable to Protestants so that they could join us, despite their disbelief in the Mass. Accordingly, Protestants were consulted and took an active part in constructing the new rite. They defined what they had made in words that could not define a Mass. And the whole rite was saddled upon us as a return to Christ’s teaching in the Gospel. Beyond the intention expressed in the new rite is the implied intention that it replace the true Mass, if only occasionally, breeding doubt over and above the insuperable obstacles to validity in the new rite’s origin (not merely human but heretical) and definition: “The Lord’s Supper or the Mass, is the sacred assembly or gathering together of the people of God, with a priest presiding, to celebrate the memorial of the Lord.” This definition was changed to ambiguity to stop the outcry, but not a word of the rite it defined was changed.

Objection—The invalid new mass (*novus ordo missae*) promulgated in 1969 was imposed on us by the world’s bishops, acting on their own responsibility, without papal authorization. There is no record of Paul VI’s involvement.

Reply—So who signed the promulgation? Obviously Paul wished and hoped to dodge responsibility. He maintained that he committed this crime in obedience to the Second Vatican Council, which nowhere suggested a new rite for Mass and whose documents and decrees could pretend to no authority without Paul’s “papal” signature.

But the new rite was developed in a Roman Congregation under the supervision of Annibale Bugnini, whom Paul had promoted to archbishop and put in charge the project. Half a dozen Protestants were consulted, and Paul officially thanked them for correcting Catholic worship. The finished product was performed before a Synod of Bishops, which rejected it. But Paul

imposed it anyway, as an (improperly conducted) experiment.

The world's profligate bishops certainly imposed this invalid substitute for Mass, each in his own Bishops' Conference, each of which set a different date for outlawing the genuine Mass of nineteen centuries. When the Second Vatican Council established the bishops' conferences it provided that they receive their agenda from Rome. Why else would all of them take up this particular subject? Why else would they all rule similarly? Can anyone seriously believe that in our postconciliar chaos all our lunatic bishops would agree on anything not ordered from above?

When the rot is universal, responsibility lies at the top. No conciliar documents are approved by all the world's bishops, even including the Bishop of Rome, but can take effect only when signed by Christ's Vicar invoking papal authority. When anything is imposed on the whole Church it is done by papal authority. When that which is imposed is beyond the competence of the imposing authority, that authority cannot impose it, and no one may accept it.

In 1973 when, as Secretary for the New South Wales branch of the Latin Mass Society of Australia, I wrote to Cardinal Freeman, Archbishop of Sydney, (Is the Pope Catholic?, pp. 29-32) over his having forbidden us the use of a chapel at Santa Sabina, Strathfield, he replied "that the Tridentine Mass cannot be celebrated. Neither I, nor any other Bishop, except the Pope himself, has authority to authorize the celebration of Mass according to the old Order."

.... Also reported in *L'Osservatore Romano* (Dec. 9, 1976), was published in Paul's letter of 11 October to Lefebvre: "It is up to the Pope and to Councils to exercise judgment in order to discern in the traditions of the Church that which cannot be renounced without infidelity to the Lord and to the Holy Spirit—the deposit of faith—and that which, on the contrary, can and must be adapted to facilitate the prayer and the mission of the Church throughout a variety of times and places, in order better to translate the divine message into the language of today and better to communicate it, without an unwarrantable surrender of principles." [The Mass instituted by Jesus Christ, it would seem, is outside the deposit of faith.]

In this same letter Montini admitted his own responsibility for both the *novus ordo* (in obvious grievous violation of Canon 1261, 1, Code of Canon Law) and suppression of the true Mass. "We have sanctioned this reform by our authority, requiring that it be adopted by all Catholics must explicitly recognize the legitimacy of the reformed liturgy, notably of the *Ordo Missae*, and our right to require its adoption by the entirety of the Christian people."

So we examine what is imposed, and discover that the Second Vatican Council documents promulgated over the signature of Paul VI contain condemned heresies, and the new "worship" promulgated over his "papal" signature contains among its heretical innovations blatant apocatastasis, Judaism, and Arianism. This places the signatory objectively in as public heresy as possible. He is a heretic even if he is too stupid to realize it. A pope must be Catholic; a heretic cannot be Catholic; a Catholic cannot be a heretic; a heretic cannot be pope. We are all heretics if we accept a public heretic as pope. We are bound by divine law. A pope is bound by divine law. Are we to believe that we have no defense against a man who pretends to be pope? Divine law is easily perceived in Paul IV's *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio* and its abbreviation in Canons 188, n. 4 and 2314, both of which provide that by the fact itself of public adherence to heresy and without any declaration a heretic loses all offices in the Catholic Church. Not only the heretic is bound by these laws. They bind also the Catholic faithful, who are bound to withdraw recognition, support, and obedience from the public heretic. These facts cannot be dismissed, ignored, or "answered" by calling them *sedevacantism*.

No one can depose a pope? A public heretic is not a pope, and needs no deposition. He has vanished, as Pope Innocent III stated.

Unfortunately, Ratzinger's unholy spirit continues to haunt. It will later this month "beatify" Antonio de Rosmini-Serbate, a major patron of and influence on the Second Vatican Council. Forty propositions extracted from Rosmini's writings have been condemned (14 December 1887) by the Holy Office and Pope Leo XIII, and are compiled in Denzinger's *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, with the rest of the heresies. This constitutes dead proof that heretics are not merely *papabile* (so they can beatify) but salvable. Ask the Feeneyites!

Try condemned proposition 32 (Denzinger 1922): "Since he who eats not the flesh of the Son of man nor drinks of His blood, has not life in him, but those who die with the baptism of water, blood, or desire, surely attain eternal life, it must be said that those who have not eaten of the

body and blood of Christ, are administered this heavenly food in the future life, at the very moment of death.— Hence, also to the saints of the Old Testament Christ was able by descending into hell to communicate Himself under the appearances of bread and wine, to prepare them for the vision of God.”

Objection—You lack humility. You must understand that Canon Law is subject to interpretation by experts and to precedents in their application and use.

Reply—Humility seems off the point. We understand the legal principle that what is not clear cannot be a binding law. You fail to realize that your personal application of 1918 code Canon 188 §4 must—despite the clearest possible intent (“by the fact itself,” “without any declaration”) of law made to protect the Church from heretical clergy, hierarchy, and popes—be ratified (in violation of Pius II’s *Exsecrabilis*) by a subsequent council or pope. Yet your legal expertise cannot tell us how, in the Church’s prevalent pitiful state of flux, to find a genuine subsequent council or pope.

Objection—So what are your precedents?

Reply—Under the present unprecedented situation, we must look for similar conditions. To end the great Western Schism, two claimants (one genuine) to the Papacy submitted resignations to a legally convoked council then in session so that the Holy See could be legally filled by a new pope.

In 1130 AD we find a perhaps closer parallel situation, in which Pietro Pierleone had himself elected by an illegally convoked conclave, although Innocent II had just been properly elected. Pierleone filled the papal office in Rome for eight years, proving by his every official act that he was not Catholic. Shortly after his death the Holy Roman Emperor brought a German army to Rome and re-installed Innocent II. The legally convoked Lateran Council (1138) condemned each and all Pierleone’s decrees and rescinded all his appointments. He is listed (Anacletus II) among the antipopes, whose long list includes Benedict XVI Ratzinger and his four immediate predecessors in the Holy See.

Objection—You remain stubbornly attached to your own interpretation.

Reply—No interpretation here. We cite the law as unmistakably written, “by the fact itself” (demonstrated public adherence to heresy) “without any declaration” (the demonstrated public heretic loses every office in the Catholic Church, because, among other cogent reasons, public adherence to heresy excludes the demonstrated public heretic from the Catholic Church). Your failure to accept this lies not in the intellect but in the will.

Objection—I cannot imagine a dynamic Church being fossilized—in a museum curio of medievalism. Dynamism is growth-evolution and one cannot remain static, to become genuine Catholics. Unless we open doors, the Church, as you would want it, would soon die out. Let’s make Love—the pivot that makes the world go round—rather than rituals, the letter of the law.

Reply—Dynamism was one of Paul VI’s catchwords as he de-energized the Church. Our doors were always open for people to enter. And they entered in droves for nineteen centuries, attracted by the missionary effort energized by the Holy Ghost and the stability found within. One good reason that we now have so many enemies is that the “Church” has sabotaged the missionary effort—our greatest, most practical evidence of love, and an essential mark of the Catholic Church—in favor of Ecumenism which dialogues with soulless and mindless religions as though they had something to improve what Jesus Christ established for all time. Paul VI replaced our mandatory worship of all ages under the pretext that he had modified “ritual and rubrics.”

Civilization had descended to its lowest level since the Deluge when Christ came. What sustained the world for nineteen centuries? The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass as established by its Victim. Observe the speed at which our civilization disintegrates with the support of its idolatrous Montini-Bugnini replacement!

Objection—I think Bellarmine must be correct that a heretic *ipso facto* vanishes into his heresy, but this (ontological) fact is not manifest and notorious until the Church declares it a sorry fact. Bellarmine, while correct, likely did not foresee the consequences of his judgment. Suarez and Cajetan did, though they did not fully grasp Bellarmine’s truth. Thus a heretical Pope remains pope in the juridic sense (though he cannot bind us to error) and Christ supplies for the means of grace (Yes, even for the 1970 missal; only a hireling abandons the flock when the wolf comes) until either the clergy/people of Rome or a Council declares a Pope no longer Catholic. Only in this way is the stability, visibility, and means of grace of the Church maintained, even as we call the heretic back to the Faith *a la* the Abbe de Nantes, *et al....* The Good

Shepherd never abandons HIS flock to the wolves but supplies the means of grace during any deviation (Avignon), apostasy, or interregnum.

Reply—How do you explain the Moslem conquest, Orthodox schism, and Protestant revolt? Can you ignore St. Paul's Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, chapter 2?

It lies in the nature of a hostile takeover from the top that no effective group is left to defend religious doctrine or worship, though without these there can be no true Church. There should have been immediate revolt against change, but few, even of the clergy, realized what was happening (though a hundred thousand resigned). Those who protested applied for redress to those who had deliberately imposed change with the deliberate intention of killing the Church. The innovators ignored all protest. They stood on their "authority" and painted the few who kept tradition insane. They drove wedges between us and encouraged the "loyal opposition" with occasional crumbs that persuaded most that they would eventually return what they had stolen. But mostly they conveyed the notion that they had the right to improve on Jesus Christ, because only one fifth of the world was Catholic.

If we pin our hopes to the people or clergy of Rome, we appeal to those who have blindly accepted massive innovation. We should logically rather seek a declaration from the millions who have refused innovation, who are disgusted with weird worship and wall-to-wall heresy, and who boycott the remaining churches.

Pope Innocent III preceded Bellarmine by three and a half centuries in declaring that a heretic *ipso facto* vanishes into heresy. Pope Paul IV formulated this into law (*Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*) when Bellarmine was seventeen years of age.

Even if you were correct that instructed Catholics cannot assess a heresy, the innovators have publicly embraced condemned heresies galore, and this alone establishes that they are condemned heretics, which should be public enough for anyone.

It is impossible that the Catholic Church of Jesus Christ has no defense against a hostile takeover, from the top or from the bottom. When taken over from the top there is no possibility of an official statement condemning the takeover, because the entire top is involved in the takeover and will simply not condemn its own actions.

We therefore turn to right reason, and find all the authority we need in the Laws of the Church, specifically *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio* and the Canon Laws in which it is synthesized, #2314 & #188. These all state with authority that apostates and heretics can hold no office in the Church to which they cannot belong on account of their heresy and/or apostasy. The penalty immediately, automatically, and necessarily follows the fact itself of heresy or apostasy, and requires no declaration from any official source, as the law itself provides. We are all bound by these laws, and by *Quo Primum Tempore* which standardized our worship against the Protestant revolt, and must refuse recognition to "authorities" which violate them and saddle us with more recent idolatries.

The proof lies in recognition of the fact that the postconciliar "Church" has replaced almost the entire religion in its laws, doctrines, sacraments, and worship. It tries to speak with the authority which it has almost stamped out. It pretends to the authority which Christ conferred on His Church for propagation, which it has criminally discontinued.

Objection—What makes you think you know better than all those bishops at the Second Vatican Council?

Reply—Perhaps not all, but most of them affixed their official signatures to condemned heresies subsequently officially promulgated by a man who had usurped the papacy for which he was ineligible by reason of his prior public adherence to known heresies. Nearly all those bishops returned to their dioceses and implemented the multiple heresies of the disastrous Second Vatican Council.

Objection—You accuse all those bishops of heresy?

Reply—Correct. I have published four books to specify their heresies. One need hold only one heresy to exclude himself from the Catholic Church. I need be correct only once in more than a thousand pages to prove the Second Vatican Council and all its signatories heretical.

Objection—So why did you not remain in the Church and fight them?

Reply—I have not left the Church. Those bishops and their clergy could not fight; they would have fought themselves twenty to fifty years earlier. Their alternatives were and are to ignore me or to declare me insane. Whether or not I am insane, I have demonstrated that they hold and propagate heresy in execution of the offices which they have forfeited.

Objection—It is incredible that the pope and all those bishops are heretics.

Reply—Those who made the laws which automatically and without declaration remove all known heretics from all offices in the Church, and consequently from the Church itself, obviously believed it possible.

Objection—Maybe the lawgivers were heretics.

Reply—You just said that you can't believe that a pope can be a heretic.

Objection—Matthew 16:18: “thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

Reply—But they may come close, as St. Paul predicted.

Objection—Can a layman judge heresy? Why must we believe you?

Reply—Any fool can recognize heresy, often by its obvious innovation.

Objection—To convert non-Catholics requires dialogue.

Reply—Matthew 28:19. “Going therefore, teach ye all nations: ...” Dialogue is an unproductive novelty.

Objection—Your rebellion splits the Church.

Reply—By strict adherence to tradition?

Objection—Teresa Bennis states on her website that you allege that Malachi Martin was pope.

Reply—He could hardly be worse than his contemporaries. I have scoured my computer and found only two (identical) references, published in reference to Giuffrè's Siridiocy:

“Now for an amazing correction. I don't believe it either. But I heard recently of a man who says that Siri told him that Malachi Martin was pope. If Siri was ‘bound by the secret,’ he was either drunk or joking. Or else the real Siri was down in the Vatican dungeon. Remember, you heard it here first.”

Objection—Ratzinger's *motu proprio* permits the Latin Mass in his churches.

Reply—Why does anyone need permission unless the Latin Mass has been forbidden? Nor has the traditional Mass been permitted, but only Roncalli's 1962 variation. Nor has it been restored, but only permitted under certain conditions.

We quote from Ratzinger's letter transmitting his *motu proprio* to his “bishops”:

“... Needless to say, in order to experience full communion, the priests of communities adhering to the former usage cannot, as a matter of principle, exclude celebrating according to the new books.”

“In conclusion, dear Brothers, I very much wish to stress that these new norms do not in any way lessen your own authority and responsibility, either for the liturgy of or for the pastoral care of your faithful. Each bishop, in fact, is the moderator of the liturgy in his own diocese. (cf. Vatican 2 Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, 22: Regulation of the sacred liturgy depends solely on the authority of the Church, that is, on the Apostolic See, and, as laws may determine, on the bishop.)

“Nothing is taken away, then, from the authority of the Bishop, whose role remains that of being watchful that all is done in peace and serenity. Should some problem arise which the parish priest cannot resolve, the local Ordinary (bishop) will always be able to intervene, in full harmony, however, with all that has been laid down by the new norms of the *Motu Proprio* ...”

Comment of Rev. Thomas Reese, editor of AMERICA, “expert on the structure of the Church”:

“When the pope authorized bishops to allow this mass in 1984, the idea was that this was a pastoral response to older people ... still so attached to this older mass that they need it. ... never to create a new desire ... for this mass.”

Ratzinger's *Motu Proprio* grants a choice between a 1962 and a 1969 innovation, each imposed with the non-existent authority of an incompetent usurper. Ratzinger pretended for years that he believes imposition of the *novus ordo missae* a mistake. Now that he can rectify this mistake he upgrades it to the ordinary official worship of the Latin Rite.

He refuses to protect altar boys from his protected pedophiles. But out of the goodness of his heart he slings a sop to the sentimental seniles who shun his officially ordinary blasphemous idolatry.

Objection—Even the rabbis praise Ratzinger's sympathetic refusal of his duty to preach the Gospel to the Jews.

Reply—Job security!

* * * * *

Florida Court sets atheist Holy Day

In Florida an atheist brought a discrimination case against Christians, Jews, and observances of their holy days. It was unfair that atheists had no such recognized days. After listening to the lawyer's passionate presentation the judge dismissed the case.

The lawyer objected: "Your Honor, how can you possibly dismiss this case? Christians have Christmas, Easter, and others. Jews have Passover, Yom Kippur, and Hanukkah, yet my client and all other atheists have no such holidays."

"But they do," said the judge. "Your client, counselor, is woefully ignorant."

"Your Honor, we are unaware of any special observance or holiday for atheists."

"The calendar says that April 1st is All Fool's Day. Psalm 14:1 states 'The fool says in his heart, there is no God.' It is the opinion of this court that if your client says there is no God, then he is a fool. Therefore April 1st is his day. Court is adjourned."

What may we assume from this? The judge is a Protestant. In the Douai Version the verse is Psalm 13:1.

* * * * *

[In line with our policy of facing urgent current problems squarely, unflinchingly, and even head-on, we present this jewel of an article inspired by a séance conducted in 1917.]

Sherlock Holmes,

a complex brainchild of Arthur Conan Doyle, cannot, we maintain, possess greater intelligence than his creator.

Sherlock exceeds in performance all contemporary classical violinists. His logical and analytical skills defy comparison. His super-intelligence resides at such a level that he finds these routine chores boring and must relieve his ennui by use of habit-forming, deleterious drugs.

All recall "Elementary, my dear Watson" and "Quick Watson, the needle!" Fewer probably remember "I say, Holmes, doesn't your brother, Mycroft, work for the government?" or Sherlock's retort "My dear Watson, Mycroft *is* the government!"

Consider the ramifications. Doyle here endows Mycroft with equal or superior mental status to Sherlock's. With what habit-forming, deleterious drugs could he relieve his ennui? Certainly not scopolamine ("truth serum")!

Doyle attributes incredible mentality to the Holmes brothers, who obviously furnish neither evidence nor example. Indeed to propose that one man can surmount the self-contradictions inherent in operating even the simplest government strongly implies mental exiguity of the proponent.

The entire question resolves itself when we discover that Arthur Conan Doyle replaced the most logical certainty of his time, the Catholic faith, with the utter foolishness, not to say diabolism, of contacting departed spirits via the (happy?) medium of spiritism (spiritualism).

* * * * *

Annunciation parish in Houston, Texas issues a four-page leaflet for announcements every Sunday. Two pages would suffice, so the other two are devoted to issues of great interest. The Ides of March issue ignored Julius Caesar to delve into the unprecedented Vatican-ordered visitation of all women's religious orders in the U. S. A., excluding cloistered, contemplative orders.

The article cites the drop in and aging of the membership. The current count is 59,000, less than one-third of the 1965 approximate 180,000. Yet, says the article, "The specific motivation behind the visitation of women religious is not clear."

Rome obviously has a problem. All those aging nuns must maintain their tasks, including property maintenance and care of those who are or should be retired, all without help of the young sisters who formerly refilled their ranks. The problem can, and probably will, be solved by suppression of convents, and even whole orders, and selling off two-thirds of their available quarters.

* * * * *

Proverbs 21:9. It is better to sit in a corner of the housetop, than with a brawling woman, and in a common house. The U.S. Bishops' Conference finally came out of the closet long enough to oppose Obama's health care plan which treats pregnancy as a fatal disease. It seems not to care too much about the health of us

sufferers from senility either. You don't suppose the bishops are beginning to feel their age? Their brawling women (liberated nuns) have booted them out of the common house to take a stand on high?

Bishop John Vaughan's Selected Sermons

Rt. Rev. John S. Vaughan, D.D., Bishop of Sebastopolis, Sermon for the Fourth Sunday after Epiphany, printed in 1919. The virtue of Divine Faith (edited)

Of all virtues ... the first and foremost is faith. ... first in chronological order, and most essential, as clearly proven from the fact that, until we possess faith, it is impossible to advance to the exercise of hope or of charity, or indeed of any other supernatural virtue whatsoever.

A mansion may be a much more magnificent thing, in itself, than the rude foundation on which it rests; yet, without the foundation it cannot exist. Similarly, other virtues may be, and are, more sublime and more admirable; yet, without faith they could not exist. ... we can readily understand the force of the Apostle's teaching: "without faith it is impossible to please God." ... Man possesses two great gifts, intellect and free will. Each has its own sphere of action; both are necessary for man's well-being. ... the will may be described as the driving power, and the intellect as the directing power. Without the will he cannot move; without the intellect he would not know his direction. If I liken myself to a ship, my will would be represented by the powerful engines that urge the vessel on, through the ocean. My will would be represented by the compass, which points the way, and enables me to steer the proper course to reach my objective in safety. The motive power, however great, would not avail unless the route were manifest. Knowledge is essential.

These principles hold good, whether I guide a material bark across the ocean, or my immaterial, immortal soul from earth to Heaven, across the tempestuous sea of life. In both cases, knowledge is a requisite, as a means to an end. But how is it acquired? Some truths we can learn by the mere exercise of our senses: That the grass is green; that birds fly; that the sun shines, are truths that we learn from personal observation. That fire burns; that water quenches thirst, and that roses smell sweet, are propositions certified by direct experience. Less obvious truths I may also acquire, without help, by the mere exercise of reason.

No one need tell me that a whole object is greater than its part; or that things which equal the same thing equal one another. By a process of mere ratiocination I may advance to the discovery of more recondite truths, as is done in geometry. But, despite all these varied means of information, doubtless our chief source of knowledge is neither our own reasoning nor our personal observation, but rather the testimony of others. Of all the knowledge we now possess, by far the greater portion comes to us on the authority of outsiders. I know that China, India, and Japan exist. I know that Caesar was a great general, and that he wrote certain commentaries; that Napoleon was a mighty commander, was taken prisoner, and died at St. Helena. I know that the earth turns on its axis, and that the succession of summer and winter is caused by the revolution of the earth round the sun. How do I know these, and countless other similar facts? I have acquired them by no personal industry. They all come to me solely on the testimony of other persons. I accept them without hesitation and without doubt; but simply and solely upon authority.

The acceptance of a statement upon the authority of another is what is called faith; and the character of that faith will vary, with the character and reliability of the authority invoked. If the authority be human, then faith is simply human faith. If the authority be divine, then the faith is divine faith. Hence, we may define Divine Faith to be the acceptance of any statements, on the authority of God.

Is faith reasonable? Is it right and just that we should submit our intellect to another, and accept statement after statement on his simple assurance? It depends. If the authority on which we rest is trustworthy, we act with wisdom and prudence; if not, we act foolishly.

A simple servant girl meets a wandering gypsy, who promises to tell her fortune, if she will but cross the gypsy's hand with a shilling. She firmly believes what she hears. Why? Simply because the gypsy is old and ugly, has a hooked nose, and wears a sugar-loaf hat. The girl indeed exercises faith, but it is a most ill-founded and unreasonable faith. It rests on a tottering foundation. It is built on sand.

Take a prudent man, who lies sick, but wishes to recover. After due inquiry, he calls to his bedside the most learned physician he can find—one who has won high reputation in his own profession. He not only asks advice but believes it, puts himself in the doctor's hands, and carefully follows out all his directions. He "exercises faith" in his physician. He believes and acts upon professional advice. This is not an unreasonable, but a most reasonable and proper faith; and though it is merely human faith, its exercise is dictated by prudence and approved by common sense. The foundation of his faith is practically firm and secure.

The physician has made a life-long study of the human body and of the various diseases to which it is exposed, and is able to give me valuable information concerning my special ailment and concerning the rules which I must follow in order to recover my lost health and strength. This knowledge, which I can acquire in no other way, is invaluable; still, it has to do only with my bodily health; it has nothing to do with that which is immeasurably more important—my soul.

If this world were the only world, such mere human faith and such mere physical knowledge might suffice. But we have immortal souls. We are destined to live on and on, forever, in a future world. Therefore, it is essential that we should know both what we must do and must avoid to entitle us to a place in the kingdom of Heaven—when this world shall have vanished away.

So soon as ever I learn that eternal life is offered me, I wish to know if the offer depends on any special conditions. If yes I at once feel the necessity of identifying the conditions. Is sin an insurmountable barrier to my entrance into Heaven? If so, how is sin to be remitted? These, and a thousand similar points must be determined, and set at rest, before I can feel any security of salvation.

These questions concern our most personal and vital interests. They are concerned with the state and condition of our souls, not during the brief moments of our present existence, but during the limitless ages of eternity. They have to do with rescuing us from everlasting torment and securing us everlasting joy and happiness.

If these questions differ from all others in importance, they differ also in this, that no human teacher or philosopher, however gifted, can hope to solve them. They touch upon the most intimate nature and attributes of God, on His inscrutable providence, and on the end and purpose of our creation and destiny. The knowledge needed is not such that I or any man, however learned and wise, can acquire by his own industry. It is a knowledge, not only greater than the human mind can arrive at by study, but a knowledge of an altogether higher and sublimer order. It is supernatural, and falls not within the circle of earthly experience. It embraces many truths which are wholly above our comprehension, and many which depend wholly and solely upon the personal will and decree of an absolutely free God. Without some external aid, how shall we—how can we—arrive at a certain knowledge of such supernatural truths? “Hardly do we guess aright at things that are upon the earth, and with labor do we find the things that are before us; but the things that are in Heaven, who shall search?”—Wisdom ix. 16.

If we are ever to reach Heaven, it is absolutely necessary that we should know the way; but since, from the very nature of the case, it is wholly impossible for us to discover it of ourselves, God, in His infinite mercy, has been pleased to reveal it to us, and to enlighten our darkness. This is referred to by Isaias, when he says: “The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light. To them who dwelt in the region of the shadow of death, to them light is risen.” (Isaias ix. 2.) Similarly, when our Lord appearing to St. Paul, bade him carry the truths of the Gospel to the Gentiles, He declared that He sent him in order “to open their eyes, that they may be converted from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and a lot amongst the saints.” (Acts xxv. 18.)

In these and other passages we clearly see (1), the absolute necessity of a revelation on the part of Almighty God, and (2), of a firm faith upon our part, in what He reveals. What we cannot discover of ourselves, He makes known to us, and by accepting these truths and acting upon them, we obtain, at last, eternal life. The obligation of believing God is manifest, for, “if the testimony of man is great, the testimony of God is greater.” (I John v. 9.) God is infinitely wise. He knows all things, and can neither deceive nor be deceived, so that there is no ground for doubt or hesitation. To call into question any statement made by God is to insult His infinite majesty and to commit a most grave sin. Because “he that believeth not, maketh God a liar, since he believeth not the testimony which God hath given of His Son.” (I John v. 19.) Indeed, there is no sin so deadly, no sin that is so severely punished as the rejection of His doctrine, and the refusal to accept His teaching. When commissioning His Apostles to go and teach all nations those things which He had commanded them, He made use of these emphatic words: “He that believes and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believes not shall be damned.”

Our blessed Lord spoke yet more severely concerning unbelievers, and added threats. After sending His Apostles to make known His saving doctrine far and wide, over the whole world, He broke forth in these memorable and truly awful threats: “Whosoever shall not hear you, nor receive your words, going forth out of that house or city, shake off the dust from your feet. Amen, I say to you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah, in the day of judgment, than for that city.” (Matt. x. 14.) ...

[In view of such horrible consequences for refusal to believe what God has revealed, how can anyone in his right mind restrict that revelation to what is contained in the Bible, which was not gathered into existence as such until late in the fourth century. The Church began without a written word of the New Testament, which itself was incomplete until about the end of the first century. Its last words (in St. John’s Gospel) declared its incompleteness as a record of Christ’s words and actions. Yet every word He said had infinite significance. And one sentence on the Biblical record in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, coincidentally in each fourth chapter’s fourth verse, stresses this point. “Not in bread alone doth man live, but in every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God.”—Matthew]

The Catholic Church, the very mouthpiece of Jesus Christ, has always taught faith in God’s word to be a matter of spiritual life or death. To hold the faith is a condition of salvation. The denial of any single article is heresy; and heresy, in the mind of the Church, is classed with idolatry and apostasy. From the earliest Councils down to the very last, that of the Vatican, assent to Catholic doctrine is required under pain of

excommunication or anathema, and assent to heretical doctrine is reprobated, under the same spiritual censures. Further, the assent to the teachings of the Church must be interior and sincere, as well as outward and manifest.

[Please recall the utter absence of anathema in the decrees and documents of The Second Vatican Council.] There are four special motives urging us to exercise the great theological virtue of divine faith: First, because God is the infinite truth, infinitely worthy of our trust and confidence. Second, because we can acquire in no other way the knowledge essential to our well-being in this world, and still more, to our well-being in the next. Third, because by the exercise of faith we offer to God the complete homage and adoration of our intellect.

Our will is made subject to God by obedience. We subject our will when we carry out commands that He imposes upon us. We thereby acknowledge that He is master of our wills, and that we owe Him the sacrifice of our personal desires and inclinations. But in all this our intellect takes no important share; and no violence is done to it. Our reason stands, as it were apart and unconcerned. Yet reason is one of God's greatest gifts to man, and should also acknowledge His sovereignty. It, too, must pay fealty. How is this done? By the exercise of faith—by forcing our reason to submit to God's revelation and to accept as true the various doctrines which He proposes, however difficult and however obscure they may seem to us. Just as we offer to God the sacrifice of our own wills, when we resist and overcome them to do God's will, so we offer Him the sacrifice of our own intellect or reason when we resist and overcome its dictates, in order to accept the revelations of Almighty God, and prostrate our puny intellect in the dust before God's infinite intellect. ...

God enunciates some sublime doctrine, such as that of the blessed Sacrament. We listen with respectful wonder as He unfolds, one by one, the marvels contained in that dogma. We try in vain to grapple with them, and to render them clear. But we fail to understand. We find ourselves face to face with mystery. Our intellect cannot help us. We must either reject the doctrine and exclaim, with the unbelieving Jews: "How can this man give his flesh to eat and his blood to drink and leave Him and walk with Him no more?" Or we must throw ourselves wholly upon the veracity of God, and abandon ourselves unreservedly to Him, before Whom the greatest intellect is immeasurably less than is the glow-worm's spark before the noonday sun. It is not here so much a question of submission of our will, (though our will, too, has a very important share in every act of faith) as the submission of the intellect.

In presence of any great mystery, our intellect is staggered. The doctrine is incomprehensible. We are wholly unable to reach to its heights, or to sink to its depths; it lies quite outside the field of human investigation. Two courses lie open. Either we trust to our own feeble light and turn away from Him Who is "the light of the world," and "walk no more with Him" (John vi.), or we must humble ourselves and force our reason blindly to accept that which it can neither see nor comprehend, simply and solely on the authority of God; crying out with St. Peter: "Lord! To whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." In short, by Faith we pay homage to God with the highest of our faculties, and, in the words of St. Paul, bring our proud reason into captivity, unto the obedience of Christ.

A Fourth motive for exercising faith is that we may thereby honor God, in a spirit of love and gratitude, Who has first deigned to honor us with His confidence, in imparting to us the secrets of His own mind. Though faith is quite distinct from charity, yet there is a most intimate connection between them. Faith leads up to the higher virtue. The very wish, on the part of God, to afford us some glimpse of His own divine nature and to make known to us the hidden counsels of His own mind, is well calculated to enkindle our love, and to draw us more closely toward Him. It even helps to produce that unity of mind, which is one of the strongest bonds of true affection. It puts our intellect in complete harmony with God's intellect. It enables us, in a measure to see as He sees, to judge of things as He judges, and to feed upon the selfsame truths; so that not only the will becomes, in a certain sense, one with God's will, but the created intellect becomes one with the uncreated. The soul becomes thus the confidant of God; is allowed to penetrate into the secrets of His mind, and to share in His own knowledge. For this our blessed Redeemer gratefully returned thanks to His heavenly Father: "I confess to Thee, Father, Lord of Heaven and earth, because Thou hast hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them to little ones." (Luke x. 21.) So, too, for a like reason, He says to His disciples: "I have called you friends, because all things whatsoever I have heard from the Father I have made known to you." (John xv. 15.)

It is clearly seen that the goodness and love of God, in opening to us the treasures of His knowledge, call for a prompt and loyal faith in all He reveals, and spurs us on, by yet another strong motive, to accept, with unwavering trust, all that He proposes to our belief.

Let us value this gift of Divine Faith as the greatest of treasures. Let us watch over it and guard it with the most scrupulous care, and beg Almighty God to strengthen it within us daily more and more. Let us resolve to act up to the dictates of faith; to live ever in the light and under the guidance of faith, and so to honor it by our conduct and example, that others, seeing our good works, may be led on from mere admiration to imitation, until they come to share our privileges and to acknowledge the same authority instituted by God

as His own infallible mouthpiece, namely, the one only true God-established Roman Catholic Church.
Amen.

Bishop John Vaughan's Easter Sermon

When the incredulous Jews demanded from Jesus Christ some proof of His divine mission, saying, "Master, we would see a sign from thee," our Lord answered: "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh a sign; and a sign shall not be given it, but the sign of Jonas the Prophet. For, as Jonas was in the whale's belly three days and three nights, so shall the Son of man be in the heart of the earth three days and three nights." (Matt. Xii. 38, 39.)

The Old Testament is full of figures, and types, and shadows of the New. Again and again we find some great event concerning our Lord's life illustrated and portrayed centuries before it occurred, in the history of the chosen people of God, the Jews. The instance before us today is from the prophecy of Jonas. In those inspired pages we are told how Jonas went down to Joppe and embarked for Tharsis. Having paid his fare, he went below to take his rest. "But the Lord sent a great wind into the sea," and raised a terrific tempest, so that the ship was in danger of being dashed to pieces. So great was the fear of all on board, that at last they sought to lighten the ship by casting the cargo ... into the water. ... Since the danger, however, seemed only to increase, they said, "Every one to his fellow: Come, let us cast lots, that we may discover why this evil is upon us. And they cast lots, and the lot fell upon Jonas." ... "And they said to Jonas, 'what shall we do to thee, that the sea may grow calm, and that we may be secure?' And he replied: 'Take me up and cast me into the sea, and the sea shall grow calm. ... And they took Jonas and cast him into the sea, and at once the sea ceased from raging.'" (Jonas i.)

"Now the Lord prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonas, and Jonas was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights." ... Then "the Lord spoke to the fish, and it vomited out Jonas upon the dry land." (Jonas i.)

This was indeed a great miracle, yet it was but a type of a far more stupendous miracle which was to come, viz., the dwelling of our Divine Lord for three days and nights in the bowels of the earth. For as Jonas was buried for three days and nights in the belly of the whale, so Christ was buried for three days and nights in the belly of the earth. And as Jonas was "vomited forth" by the fish, on the third day, so, too, Jesus Christ sprang forth by His own power from the sepulchre on the third day. Further, as Jonas, by consenting to be thrown into the raging sea, saved the rest of the passengers and crew from the jaws of death, so our Lord by consenting to be cast into a veritable sea of pain, and suffering, and humiliation during His passion, rescued all of us from the far more terrible jaws of hell. But for the sacrifice of Jonas the entire ship would have foundered with all hands. Similarly, but for the sacrifice of Christ, the entire world would have sunk into eternal perdition. For St. Paul assures us that "It is impossible that with the blood of oxen and goats sin should be taken away." (Heb. X. 4.) So, again as Jonas offered himself a willing victim, saying to the terrified mariners, "Take me and cast me into the sea," so Christ offered Himself a willing victim for the sins of the world. "At the head of the book it is written ... behold I come to do Thy will." (Heb. 7 & 8.) Lastly, as we are told that "the Lord prepared a great fish to swallow Jonas," so the same Almighty Lord prepared a special new sepulchre to receive the body of Christ, His eternal Son.

The importance of this glorious miracle of the Resurrection is seen, not only from the fact that Christ gave it as a sign of His authority, but because of the consequences which would follow, were it not true. On this point nothing can be clearer than the words of St. Paul himself: "If Christ be not risen again, your faith is vain, and our preaching is vain, and we are still in our sins." Indeed, among the many proofs of Christ's divinity, His glorious Resurrection from the dead is the foremost and the chief. St. Ambrose calls it *primum et maximum fidei fundamentum*, the foremost and grandest basis of our faith. In order to satisfy even the most critical and unbelieving of the truth of the Resurrection it is enough to prove two great facts. The first is (a) that Christ really and truly died. The second is (b) that after death He really and truly lived again.

Let us begin by establishing without doubt His death. ... In the first place, then, call to mind that He was solemnly condemned in the public halls of justice, in presence of an immense concourse of people, who were thirsting for His Blood, and who would never have rested till they had satisfied themselves that the sentence had actually been carried out. Before being dragged to Calvary He was most cruelly scourged and had grown weak and exhausted by loss of blood; further, from the evening of the previous day He had had nothing to eat, and was worn out with want of food. In the third place the brutal soldiers had woven together a crown of briars and thorns, strong and sharp and long, as we see in the models kept in divers churches to the present day. And, having plaited it, they raised it up and forced it upon His head, pressing it down with great violence, until the Blood flowed anew from a hundred fresh wounds. So weak and ill-treated a body needed but little more to deprive it entirely of life, and was in no condition to face the difficult journey up the hill of Calvary, to the place of execution. Indeed, as it was, our Lord fell several times under the weight of the Cross, which He was forced to carry so long as it was at all possible. On arriving at the summit He was thrown upon the wooden beams, and huge nails were driven through His Palms and through His sacred Feet, from which the Blood oozed out and soaked the ground. Then He was lifted up and hung suspended between heaven and earth, from His Hands and His Feet. No one could live long in that condition, however

strong, and Jesus had lost all His strength by reason of the ill treatment He had already received. Hence we are not surprised to read in the inspired narrative that, "Having taken the vinegar, He said, 'It is consummated'; and bowing His head, He gave up the ghost." (John. xix. 30.) Now, the sacred text goes on to say that "The Jews (because it was the Parasceve) besought Pilate that the legs of the three crucified victims might be broken; in short, that they might be put out of their misery, and their bodies taken down. They represented to Pilate that the Mosaic Law strictly demanded the burial of executed criminals before the night came on, and that it would be unbecoming to have three criminals hanging upon the Cross on the holy Easter Sabbath. Thereupon the executioners, armed with iron trimmed clubs, broke the bones of the two thieves. But when they came to Jesus and saw that He was already dead, they did not break His legs, but one of the soldiers (named Longinus) with a spear opened His side, and immediately there came forth blood and water." (John. xix. 32-34.)

The soldiers had already quite satisfied themselves that He was dead, so that Longinus oversteps all bounds of humane feeling when, seizing a lance, he deliberately thrusts through the side and heart of our Blessed Saviour. Observe the Evangelist does not say that he "wounded" it, but that he "opened it," so that there came out blood and water. Indeed, the fact that later on St. Thomas was able to put his hand into the side of our risen Lord, shows what a wound it must have been.

If not dead before, then, surely, He was dead then! A still more unequivocal proof was the issue of blood and water. All medical men agree that if Christ had been alive when the spear "opened His side," pure blood must have escaped from the wound; whereas it is particularly said that water as well as blood gushed from the opening. Consequently He must have been already dead. But even supposing that He had still been alive, that spear-thrust would have killed him.

If we take into consideration then intense enmity and hatred of the Jews and the way in which they thirsted for His life, we may rest assured that they would watch most carefully to see that the sentence of death, for which they clamored, and perjured themselves, and suborned false witnesses, was carried out. So there is not a shadow of doubt about the fact. But, just for the sake of argument, let us suppose that Jesus was only in a swoon or in a faint. How will that impossible supposition help our opponents? Not at all. For, had there been one little flickering spark of sensation left in Him after the taking down from the Cross the only chance of fanning such a feeble spark into life would have been the most careful nursing in a warm, well ventilated room, and the administration of nourishing food and proper clothing. But, instead of that, the body was wrapped in nothing but a linen winding sheet, and was laid in a cold stone sepulchre, unattended and uncared for, during the space of three days and nights. This was enough, and more than enough, to extinguish every trace of vitality, even on the wild supposition that any such traces had existed.

Yet unbelievers have the hardihood to ask us to believe not only that our Lord was still breathing, but that after His scourging, His crowning with thorns, His crucifixion, and His piercing with a spear, and three days and nights without food or clothing in a cold stone tomb, He was strong enough to rise up and roll back the stone from the entrance, and be as well and strong as ever.

People who believe, in the face of such evidence, that Christ did not really die, will believe anything, and are not worth considering.

But, if Christ died, it is equally clear that He rose again, immortal and impassible.

To prove Christ's Resurrection, it is sufficient to show that He lived and moved among men after the period of the Crucifixion. ...

Almighty God, Who rules over all and disposes every event of life so as to secure His divine purposes, evidently made use of the very envy and mistrust and suspicion of the Jews to further the cause of Divine truth. Indeed, if the enemies of Christ had not taken such precautions, the arguments for His Resurrection would have been shorn of much of their value.

... Consider the stratagems to which the Jews had recourse, in order to prevent the disciples of Christ deceiving them in the matter of His predicted rising from the tomb. So soon as they heard that Joseph of Arimathea had received permission from Pilate to take the Body of Jesus down from the Cross, and that he had wrapped it up in a clean linen cloth, and then had placed it in his own new monument, which he had hewn in a rock (Matt. xxvii. 58-60.), they began to take alarm. So the next day the chief priests and the Pharisees came together, and seeking an interview with Pilate, said: "Sir, we have remembered that that seducer said, while He was yet alive, 'After three days I will rise again.' Command, therefore, that the sepulchre be guarded until the third day, lest perhaps, His disciples come and steal Him away, and say to the people, 'He is risen from the dead,' and the last error shall be worse than the first." (Matt. xxvii. 62-64.) To this deputation Pilate replied: "Very well, you have a guard of your own; go, guard it as you know" (ib. 65), upon which they not only placed a strong guard around the place where our Lord's sacred Body lay, but they even took the additional precaution to "seal the stone" that closed the mouth of the sepulchre, so that no one without their knowledge could possibly tamper with it, or force it away, and so rob the Body and pretend it had arisen miraculously.

But all their efforts were in vain, and served only to make our Lord's Resurrection more conspicuous and

incontestable. The very men placed about the sepulchre to prevent any trick being played were the first and certainly the most impartial witnesses of the stupendous event. They saw with their own eyes the ponderous stone rolled back, and Jesus leaping triumphantly from the dark cavern hewn in the rock, glorious and impassible. No wonder the Evangelist tells us that "some of the guards hastened into the city and told the chief priests all things that had been done." (Matt. xxviii. 11.)

The priests and the ancients, and in fact all who heard the startling news, were naturally very much excited, and troubled, and alarmed. But what could they possibly do? The miracle was wrought. The prediction had been fulfilled. As Jonas was three days in the whale's belly, so Christ had been three days in the belly of the earth. And, as the whale had belched forth Jonas on the third day, hale and strong, so the grave gave up the crucified body of Jesus on the third day, full of grace and glory. The only escape possible from their difficulty was to bribe the guards. This they immediately proceeded to do in the most barefaced way. St. Matthew informs us how they met together and discussed the whole situation. Finally they resolved to distribute hush-money among the witnesses, and to bid them hold their tongues. "Taking counsel, they gave a great sum of money to the soldiers." (ib. 12.) Further, they even instructed them what to say, and invented a specious story, which they hoped, no doubt, might be accepted by the not too discriminating populace. They made the soldiers promise to explain how "The disciples of Christ came by night and stole Him away when they were asleep." (ib. 13.) Such a plea evidently did not altogether commend itself to the soldiers. They scarcely cared to accuse themselves to their chief of sleeping while on duty, and rightly feared the consequences of such pretended neglect. So the priests and the ancients promised to make it all right with the superior officer, saying: "If this comes to the governor's ears, we will persuade him and make it all right for you." (ib. 14.) "So, taking the money, they did as they were taught; and this story was spread abroad among the Jews, even unto this day." (ib. 15.) Surely, this account is circumstantial enough.

But quite a number of other circumstances may be pointed to as additional arguments of Christ's Resurrection, the accumulative value of which can scarcely be over-estimated. ... Let us suppose that what the Jews declared were true, and that the disciples had really been able to gather in sufficient force to roll away the enormous stone that closed the entrance to the tomb, and to break the seals, without awakening any single member of the guard of soldiers, who were watching over it, a highly incredible theory, the question still remains: What became of the Body? What did the Apostles do with it? A human body is not a thing that one can stow away anywhere. How is it that no one has ever been able to point it out? Had it not risen, the Jews might easily have discovered it, and exclaimed: "He is not risen; He is still here. Look, and examine for yourselves. You are founding your creed upon an imposture," and so forth. But this they were never able to do.

So, again, to pass to another argument. Our Lord actually appeared to His followers and friends for the space of forty days, after he rose from the tomb. And we can account for the entire change that came over His followers and disciples in no other way except by admitting that He really did move among them and assure them of His actual return to life, by virtue of His own inherent power.

Let us consider the circumstances, and we shall see furthermore that the whole history of the early Christian Church remains wholly inexplicable, unless the Resurrection is accepted. The Apostles and disciples had forsaken home and friends and occupations, to follow Him, Whom they believed to be the Messiah. They regarded Him as the Promised One, Who should free Israel from the Roman yoke and make the "chosen people" the rulers of the world. They were still carnal minded, and had not risen to the conception of a spiritual kingdom, and had no idea of a suffering Redeemer, though Christ had often tried to impress this view upon them. Even when they followed Him to Jerusalem, just before His passion, they still entertained the hope that He would at last declare Himself, and begin manifesting the glories and the triumph of Shiloh. But hope told a flattering tale. Things did not turn out as they expected. They beheld their Master betrayed, condemned, slain, and apparently unable to help Himself. Terrified beyond measure at the violence of the multitude, and at the hatred of the Sanhedrin, they fled away and abandoned their Leader to His fate.

They had looked upon Him as the Messiah, yet there He hung, dead and helpless, before their very eyes. They thought that it was He Who was to have redeemed Israel; but now they were persuaded that they had been deceived. All was now over. He was not, He could not be the Messiah, for the dead cannot lead a nation to victory. But, worst of all, He had died upon the tree of shame, the death of a common slave and malefactor. Why, the curse of Jehovah had fallen upon Him, for is it not written, "Cursed be he that hangs on the tree!" (Deut. xxi. 23; Gal. iii. 13)

In short, dejection, disappointment, disappointment and fear had taken possession of their minds and hearts, and they were ready to abandon all hope, and sorrowfully deemed their mission at an end.

Yet, wonderful to relate, only a few weeks later their whole attitude is changed! See! These cowards have become utterly fearless; these faithless followers, hiding away for fear of the Jews, now court publicity and openly proclaim the Crucified to be the Master of life and death, and the Lord of light and glory. They who but yesterday trembled at the sound of their own voices and who feared to acknowledge their Divine Master; yea, even Peter, who denied Him, with curses and oaths, at the challenge of a mere serving maid,

now knows no fear. Neither the hostility of the Sanhedrin, nor the loss of friends, nor social ostracism, nor stripes; nor torture, nor death itself, can silence Christ's followers, nor restrain their fervor and zeal for their Divine Master. With one voice they assert that He whom the Jews had so cruelly murdered is no other than the Son of God, the promised Messiah, the all-powerful Lord of the world.

In a word, some unprecedented thing had taken place. Some stupendous event had happened, which suddenly transformed them, and turned them into different beings. Something had, in a moment, banished all their fears, dissipated all their doubts, enlivened their drooping spirits, stiffened their wills, and inflamed their zeal, and made them other men. Not one, but all were set on fire. Not one, but all boldly and defiantly "preached Christ crucified, unto the Jews indeed a stumbling block, and unto the Gentile foolishness." (1 Cor. i. 23.)

How do we account for this? There is just one explanation, but only one. The simple explanation is that the truth of Christ's divinity had been made clear, certain, unmistakable and evident. They were filled with daring and heroism, and laughed at torture and death, so that some exclaimed mockingly, "These men are full of new wine." (Acts ii. 13) And why? Because they at last "knew in Whom they had believed" and were certain that (2 Timothy i. 12) He was, what He had declared, viz., the Son of the living God. He had truly risen. He had appeared and conversed with many. He had entered their council chamber, "the doors being locked," and showed them His hands and His side, and even allowed Thomas to put his fingers into the wound of His side and to assure himself of His absolute reality and identity. He presented Himself likewise to the holy women, and to St. Peter, and to the two disciples on their way to Emmaus, and "then He was seen by more than five hundred brethren at once," so that no doubt was left in the minds of any of the Apostles, but that Christ had indeed conquered death. "O! Grave, where is thy victory? O, death, where is thy sting?"

In due course every one of the Apostles (save Judas, who had sold his Master for gold), sealed their faith with their life's blood, and died glorious deaths. I say this since even St. John is reckoned as a martyr, because he submitted to death, and was actually let down into a caldron of boiling oil, though he was miraculously preserved.

Now let me ask: Do men die for a probability? Are they ready to stake their earthly happiness, their fortune, their character and reputation, and even life itself and all that life holds most dear, for the sake of a mere dream? Will they die, and submit to horrible torture, like St. Peter, for instance, who was crucified with his head downward, in testimony of a lie? Perish the thought! A thousand times, no! They endured the worst that human could devise, simply and solely because they had seen, with their own eyes, their risen Lord, and because they knew they were safe in His divine keeping.

But not only the attitude of the Apostles proves to us the great and startling reality of Christ's triumph, but also the whole after-history of His Church. As it is perfectly well known, the Faith soon spread among all people. In the first place, many thousands of Jews submitted to the true Church, and helped to spread the Gospel in other lands. Even though wealth, and learning, and position, and power were all ranged against them, the poor despised followers of "the Galilean" conquered all along the line. Within an incredible short time the Christian religion extended from one country to another and drew within its fold whole peoples and nations, until at last the Cross (once the sign of disgrace) was found raised on imperial standards and dominating over palaces of kings.

If such unheard-of results could be effected by an imposture, then an effect may truly exist without any adequate cause. As the great St. Augustine so truly observes: "If the world was converted to Christianity without a miracle, that fact itself would be the greatest miracle of all."

We need not develop the matter further, though much more might be said if time permitted. What has been said is enough and more than enough to excite our faith still further, and to fill our hearts with gratitude to God, who, for our sakes, died and rose again, immortal and impassible. To Him be honor and glory for ever and ever. Amen.

Bishop John Vaughan's Cana Sermon

"There was a marriage in Cana of Galilee: and the mother of Jesus was there. And Jesus also was invited, and his disciples" – John ii, 1-2.

This teaches that convivial gatherings are not, in themselves, wrong or blameworthy, and that we may lawfully and laudably participate. Some would condemn innocent mirth, and look askance at anyone who indulges in the simple pleasures and recreations of life. Such people not only expect too much of human nature, but contradict the clearest teaching and example of Jesus Christ Himself. His very presence at the wedding banquet is proof, if wanted, that He desires us to enjoy ourselves on fitting occasions, and to help each other throw off dull care, and to forget for a time the trials and vexatious troubles of life. It is but right that work should be sometimes interrupted by play, and that the best bow should sometimes be relaxed.

Not only did our Divine Master enter into the simple joys and festive pleasures of the merry party; not only did He share in the feast, and partake of the delicacies placed before Him, but, when the wine failed, He

exercised His Divine power to supply the want.

The guests had finished all the wine provided, placing the host in an awkward position. Our Blessed Lady, always so sensitive to least wants, noticed his embarrassment. Her compassionate heart was touched with pity. She knew her Divine Son was all powerful, and that He could easily replenish the empty flagons, if He were so minded. She knew also the boundless compassion of His Sacred Heart. She was also fully aware that, as His Mother, she had a right to seek His aid, and to claim His intervention. He had never refused her anything, and would certainly not refuse her now. So confident was she of His love and affection, that she deemed it unnecessary to formulate a special request. She merely stated the circumstances: "They have no wine." Jesus Christ at once understood that she wished Him to come to the rescue. His reply: "Woman, what is that to me and to thee? My hour is not yet come."

This "woman" sounds somewhat strange—indeed, those Protestants unacquainted with the language that our Lord spoke, or with the Greek into which His words were translated, are only too ready to use it against the Catholic Church, which treats Our Lady with such immense honor and such profound reverence. They insist that on this occasion Our Lady was rebuked by our Lord, and that He purposely treated her with scant civility. They mistakenly assume that the English or American usage and idiom apply to Aramaic and Greek words.

Now whatever of disrespect or rebuke "woman" may bear amongst ourselves is not the question. If we wish to ascertain the sense in which our Lord used this apparently offensive word, we must find out its value in the language in which St. John wrote, since he wrote under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. If this word bears no sinister meaning whatsoever in Greek, the whole argument of our accusers falls to the ground. To draw conclusions from English customs and usages, when discussing quite another language and quite another people, is to violate every principle of logic and common sense.

Every Greek scholar knows well that in the Greek, of which the English Bible is but the translation, the word GYNH carries no hint either of reproach or of disrespect. Quite the contrary, it is used on occasions when every courtesy and deference is intended. We translate the Greek "GYNH" with it no disagreeable or unworthy associations, as its English equivalent is apt to do. It casts no slur. It conveys no insult. We have the best authority for this statement. Setting aside all (prejudiced?) Catholic authorities, we turn to the reliable and very well known Greek dictionary of two Protestant scholars, Liddell & Scott; we find that distinguished Protestant scholar, Dr. Westcott: "In the word 'woman,' as employed in the Greek, there is not the slightest tinge of reproof or of severity. The address is that of courteous respect, even of tenderness."

The very context itself enforces and countenances this fact. For though the Blessed Virgin Mary had not pressed her Divine Son to work a miracle, nor even so much as actually begged Him to do so, but had contented herself with merely pointing out the wine shortage, He immediately exercised His omnipotence to do her will. What inference do we draw? Surely that the least wish of Mary has such influence with Jesus, her beloved Son, that He treats it as a command. Is further proof needed? Then watch the Blessed Virgin. She, at least, has no doubt. With the instinct of a mother, and the penetration that comes of exalted virtue, she knows full well how to interpret the words of Jesus, and sees therein no sort of rebuke. She calls the waiters and says: "Whatsoever he shall say to you, do ye." Now study carefully the conduct of Christ. He commands the waiters to fill the great jars of water, and then He changes it into wine. He does, at once, exactly what she desires of Him, and does it for her sake, even though "His hour had not yet come." He deliberately and willingly anticipated the hour in which He had intended to begin manifesting His Divinity and omnipotence, on her account and by reason of her intervention.

It is easy, then, to see that, so far from Jesus wishing that no honor be paid to Mary, it contains the strongest proof, both of the sympathy which Mary feels for her lowly children and of her readiness in appealing to Christ on their behalf, no less than of the promptness and gladness with which He is wont to assent to the slightest wish of His immaculate mother. Should this not suffice to satisfy the most scrupulous Protestant, perhaps he may heed the words of the well-known Richard Whately, Protestant Archbishop of Dublin. This Anglican divine writes: "She applied to Him when the wine was deficient. His answer has not that roughness, indeed, which our English translation gives it, from the use of the term 'woman.' The word in the original is one which denoted no disrespect, being found in the classical Greek writers applied even to a queen." Thus we see that even a Protestant Archbishop, because he is a scholar and a learned man, openly admits that the word, so far from denoting dishonor, is commonly applied to highest ladies of the land, even to queens, and this, too, by the best classical writers. How very natural then, and how fitting for our Divine Redeemer to apply it to Mary, the glorious Queen of Heaven and Earth. And how ridiculous they make themselves, who strive to make capital out of the simplicity of their hearers, or who are led away by their own folly and hatred.

It is an immense privilege to possess such an advocate as our Blessed Lady. For, of ourselves we who have often offended Almighty God are unworthy of being heard. Though God alone is the Lord of all, and though every good and perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of Lights, with whom there

is no change nor shadow of alteration," yet it is His principle to bestow His favors only on those who ask for them, in their proper dispositions. And if we are conscious that our dispositions are much more wanting in many respects, and that we are far from possessing the faith and humility and love that ought to characterize a suppliant, then we can and shall naturally turn to Mary, the Mother of Jesus, and ask her to intercede for us and with us. St. Paul tells us: "For there is no other name under Heaven given to man whereby we are to be saved." But Jesus, the exhaustless fountain and only perennial source of every grace and blessing, loves to bestow His choicest gifts through the advocacy of others. Again and again, as we find from the history of God's people, He will harden His heart and close His ears to the prayers of His rebellious children, while at the same time He will allow Himself to be influenced and overcome by the importunity of His faithful servants and beloved disciples. We find the great servant of God, Moses, interceding for his people, and actually staying the Hand of God's anger by his powerful intercession. The Israelites had fallen into idolatry and had turned their backs upon God, so that at last His anger was aroused. He solemnly declared that He would destroy them and obliterate their name from the Book of Life. But did He actually put His threat into execution? Do we read of the wholesale destruction of this rebellious people? No. God was moved to pity and forgave them. But why? What caused this changed attitude? What marvelous power held back the all-powerful arms of the Almighty, ready to strike? It was no other than the agonizing cry of God's holy servant Moses. "Moses besought the Lord" and cried out to Him in the anguish of his soul, "Let Thy anger cease and be appeased," and God granted his petition.

What a marvelous picture is set before us! On the one hand, we contemplate a stiff-necked people, in open rebellion against God, abandoning themselves to every species of licentiousness. On the other hand, we behold a justly indignant God about to destroy them from the face of the earth, thereby to vindicate His Justice upon them. But one thing stands between them and destruction. But one thing can ward off their punishment and secure for them pardon and mercy. And what is that?

Look, my dear brethren, and see! Contemplate the venerable form of the saintly patriarch Moses. His arms are stretched out in supplication. His eyes, bedimmed with tears are raised to Heaven, his long white beard streams in the wind, and a look of most intense anguish is stamped upon his face as he beseeches God, in burning accents, to have mercy and to spare. And then from the height of His throne above, God looks down upon His chosen servant and faithful follower, and calls to mind his virtue and his holiness, his zeal and loyalty. We note that He is more touched by the sanctity and devotion of this one noble and upright man than He is angered by the folly and crimes of a whole people. For the sake of Moses, He relents and extends forgiveness even to those most unworthy. At the prayer of the glorious servant of God, "The Lord was appeased from doing the evil which He had spoken against His people." (Exodus 32) If such be the efficacy of the intervention of the saints, what must be the efficacy of the intercession of the chief and foremost of the saints, the undefiled Queen of Heaven and the Mother of our Lord! Surely, it stands to reason that her intercession must far surpass in efficacy that of all others. ...

God was so provoked by the abominable crimes and the frightful obscene excesses into which the inhabitants of Sodom had fallen, that He declared to Abraham that He would destroy it, with all its inhabitants, by fire from heaven. Abraham, wrung with grief at the thought of the appalling fate that awaited his faithless people, determined to obtain a more favorable sentence. He began to plead for the salvation of the city. One might have imagined that one man's virtue, arraigned against the sins and crimes of a whole city, would have a very poor chance to prevail. But, in God's eyes, a saint outweighs a world of sinners. Hence the prayer of Abraham reached the very heart of God. "Abraham stood before the Lord, and drawing nigh he said: Wilt Thou destroy the just with the wicked? If there be fifty just men in the city, shall they perish withal? And will Thou not spare that place for the sake of the fifty just, if they be therein? Far be it from Thee to do this thing," etc. etc. And the Lord said to him, "If I find in Sodom fifty just within the city, I will spare the whole for their sake." Abraham answered: "Seeing I have once begun, I will speak to my Lord whereas I am dust and ashes. What if there be less than fifty just persons? Wilt Thou for five and forty destroy the whole city?" And He said, I will not destroy it if I find five and forty." And so the anxious and zealous Patriarch continued to plead and beseech, till he prevailed upon God to promise to spare the city even if but ten were to be found within its walls, who had kept themselves from sin and evil. And the Almighty said, "I will not destroy it for the sake of ten." (Gen. xviii, 23-33)

It is so natural for sinful man to ask others to pray for him and to call to his aid the help of the favorites and chosen servants of God, that in addition to the above we find innumerable other instances scattered throughout the pages of Holy Scripture. It is abundantly clear that God is far more willing to listen to the prayer of His Saints, and to grant their petitions, than He is to listen to those who have deeply offended Him and treated Him with neglect and disrespect. His habitual attitude also proves, beyond all doubt, that His wish is that we should address ourselves to His saints, and that we should make use of their voices, when we desire any particular favor from Him. "The prayer of the just man availeth much," says the Apostle. And therefore it is that we are exhorted so often to "pray for one another." Now if the advantages of another's prayers offered for us are very great, these advantages will increase with the greater sanctity of the advocate,

and become altogether exceptional in the case of her who is acknowledged to be the saint of saints and the holiest of all creatures. She occupies after her Divine Son, the highest place in Heaven. She sits at His right hand, as being most closely related to Him. And Jesus treats her now with the same love and consideration as He did while on earth. No one can speak with him with the same familiarity, with the same confidence, with the same certainty of being favorably heard. Indeed, when Mary asks, Jesus seems always to do more than she asks, or gives it in richer measure, as though He were anxious to treat her, not as an ordinary suppliant, but as a loving son would treat a queenly mother. At Cana she asked only sufficient wine to satisfy the wedding guests. But our Lord changed into wine the contents of six great stone water pots, which we are expressly told were “filled up to the brim.” ... Moreover, the wine into which He changed the water was of much superior quality. This was so evident that the chief steward was quite dumfounded and could not account for it. ... So we shall always find it throughout life. Mary, our tender and loving Mother, is not only always ready to come to our aid, in all our difficulties and dangers, but when she takes our case in hand she obtains for us far more than we ask, and in a measure altogether surpassing our highest expectations. Outside the Catholic Church men despise and disdain the intercession of the Saints. They are proud enough to imagine that they will be heard quite as readily as the highest of the blessed in Heaven. And they declare that they stand in need of no “mediator,” and are quite able to present their own petitions without incurring a debt to anyone else. They are completely satisfied with themselves and would not stoop to ask assistance of saint or angel.

The Catholic attitude is much humbler. He has no confidence in himself. He is far too conscious of his own weakness and past sins and offenses to feel worthy of a favorable answer to his prayers. He most willingly avails himself of the help of others. There is nothing of the Pharisee about him. Rather taking the publican for his model, he stands “afar off,” and in an attitude of profound humility acknowledges his unworthiness, in which he beseeches the saints and angels, and above all the Immaculate Virgin, to come to his assistance, and to procure for him what he cannot obtain for himself.

God listens to the humble and closes His ears to the proud. And there can be no doubt but the man who stoops to ask others to help him possesses a greater degree of humility than one who proudly disdains the cooperation of anyone, however favored in the Court of the Great King. Among many Catholics, indeed, prevails the admirable custom of offering every prayer and every suffering and trial, and all else to God, through the hands of Mary. Instead of presenting directly to God their actions, words, thoughts, penances, and the rest, they place them lovingly in the hands of God’s Blessed Mother, and request her to deign to offer them to her Divine Son on their behalf. They do so, not because they think they cannot make the offering themselves, but simply because, in their humility, they know perfectly well if it is made through Mary, God will receive it more willingly, and hearken more readily to the prayers that accompany it. Let us then frequently have recourse to her in all our needs. If we do so, we shall soon experience the power of her intercession. When we are in difficulties, or in want, or under some grievous trial, she will obtain succor for us. And, as He changed water into wine at Cana, so will He, when she asks, change the tasteless water of our careless and listless lives into the rich and luscious wine of true sanctity and perfection.

THE FATIMA CRUSADER has branched out.

In its Summer 2005 issue under the banner, *Defending the Papacy*, Christopher Ferrara has begun to come out against Sedevacantism. He should have given more thought to his title; the sedevacantist is clearly the papacy’s prime defender in demanding that the claimant fit the office.

Having perused his eighteen-page introduction and its too numerous charges and digressions, and rather than await his following articles, I have opted against piecemeal rebuttal in favor of stating my own position, and the circumstances which induced me to assume it. I can thereby avoid defense of all the sedevacantists that Christopher has identified. He has discovered that the number of sedevacantist positions nearly equals the number of antipopes since 1958.

The Church has four marks of identification: it is one, holy, catholic, and apostolic.

Its unity is demonstrated in the Apostles’ Creed doctrine, the communion of saints, whereby all Catholics of all times and places hold the identical doctrine revealed by Jesus Christ and passed on to us through His Apostles and their successors, the popes and bishops of the Catholic Church.

Its holiness is exemplified in its worship and sacraments, all of divine institution, and as well by the content of its doctrine — including its Holy Scripture and tradition. It is manifested in its martyrs, in its saints, and in its general effect on its contemporary civilizations, such as mediaeval Europe and the later Roman Empire.

We see its catholicity in its presence everywhere and in all times, identifiable by its one body of doctrine and its one sacramental system and worship all revealed from its one divine source.

The Apostles carried this identical revelation to all known parts of the world, and all became martyrs in the process. St. John must be included; it was not his fault that he survived that caldron of boiling oil into which he went willingly, rather than deny his God. But these men were only frail disciples until they were sent—which was what made them Apostles. It is not only that the Church continues to receive their doctrine that

makes it apostolic, but that the Church has always continued their same apostolic methods. The chief evidence of apostolicity is the missionary effort, which was clearly manifest until the end of the Second Vatican Council.

When Jesus Christ ascended He left us a Vicar, whose name He had changed to Rock, to emphasize stability and durability. He and his successors constitute an unchangeable standard of unity. They rule and preach with Christ's own authority, and are bound to preach His exact and complete revelation. They have no competence or authority to add or subtract—to deviate in any way, shape, or form from His perfect, complete revelation. His revelation is eternal truth, in His own image—not subject to passage or vicissitudes of time or place. Each successor of St. Peter must belong to the same communion of saints and hold and maintain all its doctrine, and condemn anything and everything opposing or contradicting it. This extends to interpretation; no pope may attach a new point of view, a new slant to a single revealed word. To contravene this would nullify, warp, and pervert the papacy, and would automatically unseat him, according to the law of the Church in effect for at least five centuries. It survived into the 1917-18 Code of Canon Laws:

CANON 188: All offices shall be vacant *ipso facto* and without any declaration by tacit resignation in the following cases: (4) if a cleric has publicly lapsed from the Catholic Faith;

IUS CANONICUM DE PERSONIS: The pope's power is removed: (a) through death (b) through resignation (c) through lapse into certain and incurable insanity (d) through notorious lapse into heresy. This possibility certain people soberly deny a priori, but no reason is speculative which absolutely excludes this. For the pope is not given infallibility as a private teacher. If he infringly (*perfracte*) and publicly deny a dogmatic truth, he is no longer a member of the Church, and therefore cannot be its head, and by the very fact loses jurisdiction. This is done by divine law; for this reason the sentence, which in this case the Church would pronounce, would be not of deposition but of mere declaration. controversy concerns a heretic pope. Innocent III openly grants the possibility. (*Sermo IV in cons. Pontif.*: "He can be judged by men, or rather be shown judged, if he clearly vanishes into heresy, because he who does not believe has been judged.")

This admitted, canonists have differed in various opinions, of which the two extremes are: (1) of those affirming that a pope loses jurisdiction on account of heresy merely occult, (2) of those contending that a pope can neither appear nor be deprived of jurisdiction even for public heresy. Both are considered improbable today. And the same judgment (improbability) must be applied to a third, formerly held even by many doctors of great reputation (Cajetan, Suarez), according to whom a publicly heretical pope would not be *ipso facto* deposed, but must be deposed by the Church. For this contradicts the certain principle of law: that a legitimate pope is subject to no human power. – Joannes Chelodi

A genuine pope is protected from heresy, according to the defined doctrine of papal infallibility. No sin is imputed. Who cares what kind of heretic cannot be pope? If we spot a heresy we are obliged to complain to proper authority. So in 1994 we compiled a twenty-four-page delation of Karol Wojtyla for multiple heresy, and submitted it to Ratzinger's "Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith." Many copied and sent it, as did we, by registered mail with return receipt requested. Not one of us received even an acknowledgment. What can proper procedure accomplish when heretics fill all positions of authority? A General Council can depose a heretic pope? Who can convoke a General Council?

I was born during the pontificate of Benedict XV, who took St. Pius X's pressure off the modernists, allowing them back into positions of influence, such as seminary faculties. All my formal education was Catholic, including three years in a preparatory seminary, where one of my instructors appeared to be a modernist. From my four years as apologist for the Church in the army, I discovered that I didn't know enough. [Despite my shortcomings I never lost an argument. Many ended in such an exchange as: "Aw, you Catholics are just a flock of sheep. You believe whatever the pope (priest, bishop) says." "Nonsense! I know exactly what I believe and why." And I had St. Peter in his first Epistle to back me: (iii, 15) "But sanctify the Lord Christ in your hearts, being ready always to satisfy every one that asketh you a reason of that hope which is in you."]

So I pursued my subject, and eventually accumulated a roomful of Catholic literature. This does not prove that I know more, but demonstrates my more than passing interest, and my bias in the Church's favor. So I continue apologies against any and all I encounter. An encounter, in 1973, developed the fact that all this man's life every Catholic he knew had on every occasion gladly explained any and every Catholic belief. But now the same men refused to talk. Even when Dr. Leslie Rumble of Radio Replies fame wrote a pamphlet condemning Pentecostals and charismatics, Paul VI visited the "Catholic" charismatic conference in Rome with words of encouragement—in stark contrast to his treatment of traditional Catholics.

Very few Australian priests or bishops would open their mouths on doctrinal matters; within two weeks some one in Rome would surely pull the rug from under their feet. This is an utterly unprecedented situation in the Church. The Second Vatican Council brought this on. Until Pius XII died we all believed and professed the same. Nothing was more certain than Catholic doctrine and practice. This unanimity was the direct result of proper occupation of the papal office. We had a pope, a standard of unity, to which all

adhered. We have had no such period since he died. Clearly we lack a standard of unity, a pope, and the deficiency dates from Pius XII's passing.

So who are we to depose a pope? But these five usurpers are (were) not popes, and require no deposition. All we do is cite the law, which excludes public heretics from election, even if elected unanimously. Their heresies are easily identified from random perusal of Denzinger. Some clerics question the layman's ability to read, to understand what he reads, or even to identify a heresy. So why have they not taught us? Will we not go to hell for holding heresy? Have not nearly all heresies been propounded by the clergy?

No one may seriously argue that the postconciliar "church" is identical with the Church of nineteen centuries. Different worship, different sacraments, different doctrine—all of human, therefore incompetent, origin—have been imposed on us. This postconciliar "church" fails the test of the communion of saints. It has nothing in common with nineteen centuries of Catholicism. Since it is clearly not the Church Jesus Christ founded, it cannot claim that His promise to be with His Church all days applies to it. Nor does it appear to realize that His was a contingent promise. His continued presence depended upon the Church's fulfillment of His command to preach His Gospel to all nations. And the postconciliar "church" has discontinued all missionary effort. And four fifths of the world is still non-Catholic.

But Christ intended His Church to last till the end of the age. And He willed that Peter should have perpetual successors. It is commonly held that God wills the salvation of all men. Has the Church ever held (till after the Second Vatican Council) that all men are saved? Why did Christ say: "he who believes not shall be condemned?" (Mk, xvi, 16) Or: "But yet the Son of man, when he cometh, shall he find, think you, faith on earth?" (Luke xviii, 8)

And what of St. Paul's infallible prophecy of an apostasy? (II Thess. ii, 2) The Antichrist will appear to have won. So where will be a visible pope? Unless he is himself the Antichrist? If so, will he have been properly elected? Will he have been eligible? Will there be enough Catholics to elect him?

A case can be made that we have had the apostasy. For it to have been prophesied it would seem necessarily more widespread than the Arian heresy, the Orthodox schism, the local victories of Islam, the Protestant Revolt, or the spread of Communism. It would be comprised of Catholics, for no one else would be an apostate. Sane Catholics would hardly embrace advertized apostasy, and thereby assure damnation. So they would be deceived into it by credible people: popes, bishops, priests, brothers, nuns. Since no one any longer trusts any of these, we may assume that the apostasy has taken place. If so, all adherents of the new "church" are in apostasy, and there are not enough (necessarily traditional) Catholics left to constitute a noticeable apostasy.

So where are the heresies? Everywhere! As we leaf through the documents of the Second Vatican Council we cannot help seeing that we are in a fog. Such ambiguity and obfuscation cannot have arisen accidentally. But now and again they clearly break forth into heresy. For instance:

Vatican II (Declaration on Religious Freedom, 11): In the end, when He completed on the Cross the work of redemption whereby He achieved salvation and true freedom for man, He also brought His revelation to completion. This bald statement, in no way modified by context, is unnecessary in and completely unrelated to context. It is either incredible stupidity or devious purpose, and opposes Catholic doctrine. It contradicts Christ Himself at the Last Supper: "I have yet many things to say to you but you cannot bear them now." (John xvi, 12) It removes from His revelation (1) His resurrection, (2) His explanation of His fulfillment of the prophecies, (3) His establishment of the sacrament of Penance, (4) St. Thomas' skepticism and its dissipation, (5) John xxi, 15-17 (Feed My sheep), used to establish the primacy of St. Peter and the papacy, (6) His mandate and mission to His Church, (7) His Ascension, and (8) the descent of the Holy Ghost.

Choosing revelation is, by definition, heresy.

Vatican II (Religious Freedom, 2): the human person has a right to religious freedom all men are to be immune from coercion in such wise that in matters religious no one is to be forced to act in a manner contrary to his own beliefs. Nor is anyone to be restrained from acting in accordance with his own beliefs, whether privately or publicly, alone or in association within due limits. (this) right has its foundation in the very dignity of the human person, known through the revealed Word of God and by reason itself. This right is to be recognized in the constitutional law whereby society is governed. Thus it is to become a civil right.

Pius IX (*Quanta Cura*, Dec. 8, 1864): from this wholly false idea of social organization they do not fear to foster that erroneous opinion, especially fatal to the Catholic Church and to the salvation of souls, called by Gregory XVI insanity; namely, that "liberty of conscience and worship is the proper right of every man, and should be proclaimed.... by law in every correctly established society"

The Council appears to desire establishment of man's legal right to go to hell. But more than that, this heretical document was promulgated as Catholic doctrine over the "papal" signature of Paul VI. This would have removed him from the papacy, had he held it. He was ineligible, for public heresy, long before election. Should anyone wish proof, he need only consult **Paul VI: Dialogues**, by John G. Clancy. The book contains only public utterances and documents of Paul VI, before and after election. It is almost sure to

convince the reader that Paul never said anything orthodox in his life. Nor should we forget that Paul's two John Paul successors placed their signed approval on this document, and all the rest of the fog. These two dedicated their "pontificates" to the further implementation of the Second Vatican Council. Like their immediate predecessor, they were ineligible by reason of public heresy, as shown.

The Second Vatican Council has come close to destroying the Catholic Church. We have changed from an orthodox monolith in which we all agreed, to a montage of disaster areas, separated along linguistic and nationalistic lines, all artificially split from all our Catholic ancestors.

We owe all this in turn to the man "inspired" to convoke the Council, the man removed from his Roman teaching job for heresy, the man who went into the 1958 Conclave knowing that he would emerge "pope," and who, perhaps as a warning or declaration, assumed the name and number of a previous antipope.

If you refuse this argument from a layman (Christopher Ferrara is a layman.) you might consult Father Saenz y Arriaga's **The New Montinian Church**: (page 303) "...unavoidable dilemma ...: either we save the Church, or we obstinately continue defending two Popes and a Council guilty of demolishing the unity of the Church."

This 1985 translation of the 1972 updated Spanish book is 598 pages of unmasked novelties. In a time of heretics such as Küng, Congar, Rahner, De Lubac, Schillebeeckx, and Teilhard de Chardin, Father Saenz was the only man excommunicated by Paul VI, possibly for another excerpt from the same book:

"... Golden Book of Italian Nobility for the period 1962-1968, on page 994, we find Montini ... : A branch of the homonymous noble family from Brescia, originally from Val Sabbia, wherefrom their noble blazon comes and which avows as its sure trunk and founder, a Batholomew (Bartolino) de Benedictis, said Montini being of Hebrew origin. The family spread itself throughout Lumezzano, Sarezzo, Nave, Concesio, and Brescia. The family name appears repeatedly in the Rural Noblemen registry, between 1946 and 1948. In Sarezzo, in the gallery of the Montini family, there is a genealogical tree prepared by Andrew Bosio (deceased 1795) alderman of the community of Sarezzo, who documents the inclination of the Montini family to be notary publics, physicians, jurists, religious and ecclesiastics, some of whom became very famous. By virtue of the apostolic constitution *Urbem Romam*, of January 4, 1746, the family became a member of Roman nobility."

(page 391, following five pages detailing Paul's public wearing of the emblem of the Jewish high priests, the ephod).

We have a theological, Scriptural solution to our problem: "Beware of false prophets, who come to you in the clothing of sheep, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. By their fruits you shall know them. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit, and the evil tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can an evil tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, shall be cut down, and shall be cast into the fire.

Wherefore by their fruits you shall know them." (Mt. vii, 15-20) The papacy is by definition a good tree.

Can a genuine pope have produced or continued this all too evident disaster?

A Catholic's first, last, and always obligation is to keep the faith—all of it; he may not pick and choose. Nor can the Church impose on him a necessity to choose between popes. Without faith it is impossible to please God.

A layman lacks authority, but he must exercise judgment. If two popes disagree on a matter of faith or morals he must follow only one. By the revelatory nature of Catholicism he must choose tradition over novelty. If he follows the novelty he deserts his faith. He is bound straight for hell.

He is told that he may not depose a pope. But there is no possible prohibition against demonstration of the fact that the pope was ineligible or has deposed himself. As soon as the layman perceives this fact, he must apply the law—he cannot wait for a declaration that may never come and is in any case utterly unnecessary by law. He must refuse to obey, to acknowledge, or in any way to deal with the usurper or anyone who acknowledges the usurper's claim.

If the majority (Let us count the millions who simply left the Church in disgust at the endless changes.) of Catholics accept a man as pope he is surely pope? Huge numbers never examine the facts, for no problem exists. Is the pope not infallible? Can he not do as he pleases? Two unrelated questions! If the pope is infallible (in his narrow field) he cannot be a heretic. If two popes oppose each other in this field, one is undoubtedly a heretic—not possibly pope. A pope is bound in faith and morals to his predecessors.

Siridiocy

I know a man who professes to believe that the only thing that can save the Church is proof that Cardinal Siri was pope. For fifteen years he has had financial support and a free hand to prove it. He has written a veritable bale which purports to bear on his subject, including reports of pathetic attempts at investigation doomed to fail because of refusal of the criminals involved in the plot to confess, as much as to his inappropriate methods and his choice of help. Genuine investigation would pursue all pertinent facts, even

those which appear to oppose the expected proof. But our sleuth has rejected help, and refused to consult witnesses who seem to him to oppose his theory. These are the very witnesses needed, for both the entire picture and a solid rebuttal of their opposition. In his view, it has suddenly become vital to consult all survivors of the period of the theft of the Church who can reverse the process. They were considerably less scarce, though equally vital, fifteen years ago.

Query—Have you read **Project Harvest Moon** and **Pope Gregory XVII** on Griff Ruby's **Straight Stuff**?

Reply—I liked them, especially the comment on the readiness to excommunicate those who differ from one's own views among those who can't make a good case. This comment seems more than apt when applied to the chief promoter of the Siri theory, whose investigative methods have driven him into frustration. He refuses to recognize the fact that no one needs his proof, if ever he finds it.

We have been given an infallible test: "By their fruits ye shall know them." This comes close to a command. We are to apply this test. No one can deny the baneful effects of the Second Vatican Council. But who gave us this disaster? And could genuine popes promulgate obvious heresies in its decrees and documents?

So we must look at the Conclaves which produced such fruits. The 1958 Conclave gave us an impossible pope. We know this by his fruits. But he was the fruit of the Conclave, which we must know and evaluate by its fruits. It matters not how accomplished, whether by setting aside the election of a proper pope or not. Still less can it matter who was supposedly elected. The glaringly obvious fact is that the Conclave produced an impostor—an antipope who even took the name and number of an antipope. That is all we need on which to proceed to correction—to the recovery of the religion founded by Jesus Christ. We cannot afford the time to identify the man supposedly elected two days earlier when the white smoke went up. One man has pursued his fixation for seventeen years, and has not arrived at proof. I see no reason to assume that he ever will. Meanwhile he has seriously impeded and delayed action to recover our obviously stolen Church. Nor has he been alone. Nearly all conservative and traditional groups and publications gratuitously grant legitimacy to our last four antipopes. They rush to battle minus a known objective and the will to win. To win this war we must identify the enemy, then beat him over the head till he drops.

Griff Ruby drew attention to the preposterous nature of the theory. Then he shocked me by calling me one of the Siri Theory's greatest adherents. I had always assumed that Gary Giuffrè, chief promoter of the Theory, was slow and inefficient, but operated in good faith under extreme Vatican obfuscation. But when, understandably, his associates grew impatient for results, he took their impatience for accusation, and began to lay about him in a style worthy of his original investigation. We were all out to remove him from control of the main effort, the *sine qua non*, the Siri Theory. I discovered myself lurking anonymously in the background, waiting to see how fared the tactics of my co-conspirators. He made outrageous charges against several, and he will not stop. He had even borrowed money from some, though his investigations were amply funded. He quite obviously thought it treachery toward himself to furnish me his pitiful book, which, he maintained, was essential to proof that we had four antipopes in a row. His far from normal reaction is based on recognition of his own shortcomings. He even had Masses said to remedy the dissension (all of his own making) among us. No one else took any but defensive action. Most frustrating is the likelihood that honest investigation could very well have developed that the Church was deliberately taken over from the top at the 1958 Conclave. But Gary Giuffrè avoided all contact with those not in sympathy with his preconception. So the issue was never settled, and the funding continued.

But Gary is a great priest-finder. He tracks them down and brings them to St. Jude's Shrine, so that Catholics in the area need never do without the traditional Mass. So he has maintained such jewels as Hector (the collector) Bolduc, Mario Blanco, and Vincent (*novus ordo*) Le Moine, all up to his strict standards. You may have read about our trials with Le Moine in *The Enemy Is Still Here!*, pages 342 to 353, in which he is called "Father X." Gary had received so many complaints that he told us all to write them directly to Le Moine, so that Gary need not always be the bad guy. So he kept Le Moine there (too hard to replace!). He didn't want to hear from young people reporting for pre-marital instruction to a foul-mouthed priest in a pink shirt. Or from mothers who took their children out of church during pornographic sermons. Or from those who failed to appreciate that to obtain certain indulgences they must go to a *novus ordo* church. Or from people like me who understood the blasphemous nature of his "mispronounced" Latin during Mass(?). Gary later (in writing) characterized my complaints as "insanity"—which was easier than dealing with them. He eventually induced Le Moine to leave after enough quit going to "mass" to affect the collection.

Gary lacks both objectivity and passion for accuracy. Every issue assumes the paranoid pastel of his personal paintbrush. In a lesser fashion he has caused nearly as much delay to settling the issues and recovering our Catholic Church as the endless wait for Marcel Lefebvre to act. There are a lot of kooks in this business; if they can be induced to battle each other instead of the enemy, the usurpers will be left in charge undisturbed. Except for Gary, *cui bono*? Who has benefited from this entirely irrelevant theory? Only the consequently undisturbed usurpers.

A years-too-long tale of a shaky hypothesis.

In late 1991 I swung around the United States to become acquainted with fellow participants in the war to recover the Catholic Church. My second stop was Houston, where I met people involved with St. Jude Shrine in Stafford, Texas. Among these was Gary Giuffr , who showed me his impressive ten-hour slide presentation of how our Church could have been stolen. Since the process began in the period right after the death of Pope Pius XII, it seemed evident that the trouble grew from the 1958 Conclave which elected his successor, especially in view of unusual, even suspicious circumstances. White smoke had issued from the Sistine Chapel stove in which the ballots were burned October 26, and the Vatican radio had announced the election of a pope. It was all a mistake, so it was said, and John XXIII emerged two days later, to the plaudits of the world press—never before friendly to the Church.

Gary had reduced the argument to print. He showed me the sample volume, some four to five hundred pages, and introduced me to his publisher. He needed a little more research, to pin everything down. This, I thought, was a live proposition, within a year or two we would have this powerful weapon on the market. I procured the funding.

In 1999, after I had moved from Australia to the Houston area, I was given a glimpse of the work still in process. I cut the unnecessary words from a chapter, and recommended dropping the final irrelevant paragraph. “If we drop that paragraph,” said Gary, “we must include a chapter on that subject.” (A chapter to replace a paragraph? The man surely needed help—but he wanted none.) “I’m writing for lunkheads,” he said. Thanks, but what would we lunkheads do? How much over-writing can even a lunkhead stomach? In late 2004, after discovering that Gary had sat on pertinent information for five years, I grew curious about the inexcusable delay, and asked for all the material. It took me two months to reduce it all to a size some one might read, say two hundred pages, down from five thousand. I eliminated a long chapter recording the history of the Church in Mexico and Texas from the landing of Cortez. (The 1958 Conclave was Montezuma’s Revenge?) I threw out a chapter which tarred fiction writer Malachi Martin as a liar, and another chapter for paranoia—no one would provide the evidence or cooperation Gary needed.

Seldom have I seen such hopelessly incompetent use of the language. Nearly every sentence contained from three to a dozen extra words. Each paragraph held at least three extra sentences. Each chapter was at least three paragraphs too long. It seemed like a series of school compositions which required a set number of words, so Gary sandwiched them in till he attained the count. (To “satisfy” his contract.)

When this criticism was relayed, he quoted me as calling his *magnum (maximum) opus* “fluff.” This expression I denied. Not only inapplicable—fluff floats!—it is not in my active vocabulary. Gary published this denial as denial of my criticism in the last paragraph. He even said that (in 1999) I wanted to write his book for him. True, I offered. But I wanted no association with such a bomb. To hear Gary, I had muscled in on his project to which he had devoted seventeen (fruitless but financed) years. His idea of research is to collate whatever can be made to fit his preconception, and to reject anything contrary or inconvenient. (Truth?)

He adduced in his defense that the man to whom he was responsible for his project had not complained of the quality of his writing. But he sent this pile, thoroughly shuffled, to a man with no time to sequence it, and less time to read it. He could have assembled much more deathless prose, or even have edited what he had, had he not spent six of those seventeen years on the telephone—to lunkheads?

He made a federal case out of the fact(?) that some one supplied me the text (though far from complete—whole chapters yet to be written) of this monumental (though part-time) work. He objected that I was unsympathetic. He based my attitude on objections raised during his then fourteen-hour slide presentation, over five years ago. (It has since expanded six hours.) I am supposed to have created a scene (which no one else recalls) over his mistranslation of a line from the 1870 Vatican Council document, *Pastor aeternus*. [Denzinger 1825]: *Si quis ergo dixerit, non esse ex ipsius Christi Domini institutione seu iure divino, ut beatus PETRUS in primatu super universam Ecclesiam habeat perpetuos successores: aut Romanum Pontificem non esse beati PETRI in eodem primatu successorum: anathema sit.* Gary had wrested these words to read that Peter will have perpetual successors in the primacy over the universal Church, whereas it reads that in 1870 Peter has (*habeat*, not *habebit*) perpetual successors, as translated by Roy J. Deferrari in *The Sources of Catholic Dogma*. I corrected, as anyone would, to improve Gary’s presentation. But he interpreted me in his own paranoid way and harbored resentment in his heart (and in E-mails in and out of the country) for at least five years—and perhaps longer. I had corrected the same point years earlier in Santa Monica, where neither of us had a Denzinger. So he phoned home and had the offending words photocopied and faxed, with the same result—but no apparent effect on Gary.

Gary’s reaction to this non-issue typifies his attitude to all query and criticism, justified or not. This has, in fact, prevented him from releasing his *magnum opus*, though he has parted with entire chapters to strangers on the internet. He has yet to consult Elisabeth Gerstner, foundress of *Una Voce*, who alone predicted the utterly unexpected “election” of Angelo Roncalli before the 1958 Conclave, because she disagrees with his

Siri theory, which he, after seventeen years' investigation, cannot prove. Agreement is preferable to truth, right? But even Gary, in his *magnum opus*, has written that Roncalli went into the Conclave sure that he would emerge pope. But Gary would not interview the lady who witnessed the hatching of the plot in the Vatican office where she worked at the time, and personally knew the cardinals involved—the lady who has always insisted with excellent reasons that since 1958 we have had no pope! Is that not what Gary intends to prove? Would not publication of his unnecessary proof(?) end his funding?

Why Giuffré's Excessive Reaction?

We had hoped to drop the amazing subject of the split over the Siridiocy. Seventeen years of Giuffresearch had proven fruitless. The man had failed his unnecessary project, unless he had other ends in view, such as distraction and delay. Let's get on to something with better prospects of success.

A committee had been formed to concentrate on the major problem—how can we recover our Catholic Church? Under the impression that Gary Giuffré's projected book would contribute toward the objective, the committee offered help to expedite its publication. Gary agreed at least five times to send me his completed chapters to be edited for publication by Silvio Mattachione. But he agreed so that no one else—several already had them on compact disk—would send them. When, tired of the delay and with Giuffré's prior knowledge, one of them sent me a copy, Gary accused him of the foulest treachery and betrayal.

Another major project of the committee to speed publication of Gary's book was translation of Italian works unavailable in English, including about half the writings of Cardinal Siri himself, which had been procured by Mr. Mattachione. Gary had always opposed full translation (all we needed was a few "sound bites"), but suddenly, decided Gary, we could not proceed without full translation, which (on Gary's past performance) would consume time by the year. He also declined to publish without "the smoking gun." It was fine for the committee to push, he said, but who would take care of Gary's orphaned children after his book was read in the Vatican? What a pity he had not considered this fifteen years earlier when he had accepted funding to prepare and publish his "evidence!"

About a week before last Christmas Gary wrote to Silvio and included a glowing tribute to Silvio's support. Less than two weeks later Gary was slandering Silvio overtime. What made the difference? Silvio's trip to Italy without Gary. The overall reaction was so far out of proportion that we entertained great doubt of Gary's sanity. From some of his book we suspected paranoia. But investigation suggested that his problem was almost normal fear of discovery of guilt—he had deliberately deceived us, and the record was clear. I quote from Gary Giuffré's unpublished book, *The Plot Against the Pope*:

Reports of Siri's earlier papal election, acceptance, and forced surrender of office are strengthened by the 27 October 1958 *Corriere della Sera*. The Milan newspaper stated that on the previous evening, white clouds of smoke ascended from the Sistine Chapel stovepipe for several minutes, to thunderous cheers of "*Bianco! Bianco!*" from the piazza below. When gray smoke followed a short time later, Prince Chigi telephoned the Secretary of the Conclave, Msgr. Santoro, inside, to inquire as to what signal the conclave officials had intended. Santoro instructed Chigi to notify Vatican Radio that "no matter what, the smoke is white and positive." Yet, no pope appeared on the papal balcony. Father Pellegrino, who had already announced repeatedly on Vatican Radio that a new pope had been elected, was told that he had incorrectly perceived black smoke to be white because of the numerous search lights pointed at it. ...

But neither the Associated Press nor The Tablet reported the fact that confirmation of the election was received by Vatican Radio independently of the smoke signals. For Milan's *Corriere della Sera* revealed that an official, inside the conclave, decided not to rely upon the stove, and secretly passed a note, via one of the revolving turntables (used for passing food to the Cardinals), outside to the Marshal of the Conclave, so that the latter would inform Vatican Radio that the new Pope had indeed been elected:

"Last evening . . . the smoke was white like that in the morning, but less dense, with black streaks at the end, causing opinions to be suddenly and ardently divided. The radio however, calmly, declared that the smoke was white, and invited the population to approach the piazza to receive the benediction of the new Pope.

And this happened only because the Secretary of the Conclave, Monsignor Santoro, who was not completely confident in the stove, had made a call through one of the turnstiles to Prince Chigi, and had *surreptitiously* passed him a letter in which he told him to alert the radio that, no matter what, the smoke was white and positive." (Silvio Negro. "*Minoranze tenaci si oppongono alle candidature piu favorite*", *Corriere della Sera*, 28 October 1958, Milan, page 1)

Note that word, *surreptitiously*. Doesn't it sound suspicious? It should—it was not in Silvio Negro's original article. Even more suspiciously, Msgr. Santoro was not in the 1958 Conclave! So how did he sneak a letter out? Giuffré placed him and his letter inside surreptitiously by proxy.

He conveniently omitted a few paragraphs from Silvio Negro's news story of October 27, 1958. The Conclave had not finished, and no one had yet heard much about the previous day's white smoke. Things did not seem to add up. So Silvio Mattachione dug out the original story and discovered the missing words. This is what Giuffré had feared, and tried to forestall by most cruel and conscienceless destruction of Silvio

who had supported him far beyond the call of duty for eight years.

On to the proper translation: It might be of comfort to Father Pellegrino to learn that what happened yesterday had already occurred in 1939: the “Fumata” (smoke) that was supposed to be black appeared initially very white, thick, almost chalky, and streaked with black shadings in the end. That night, after the positive “Fumata” (smoke) that followed the first ballot and, therefore, ahead of time—a case which might take place even this time (1958) both in the morning and in the afternoon—the “Fumata” (smoke) was white as that of the morning, but not as thick, complete with black streaks in the end, and hence the opinions were presently heatedly divided. The radio, however, very composed, declared the “Fumata” (smoke) to have been white, and invited the population to go to the square to be blessed by the new Pope. And that took place only because the secretary of the Conclave, then Monsignor Santoro, utterly distrustful of the stove, had had Prince Chigi summoned to one of the wheels (turnstiles), and handed him a letter in which he told him to advise the radio that, in any case, the “Fumata” (smoke) would have been white and positive. (end of translation)

As subheading for his last four paragraphs Silvio Negro had written: “The Case of 1939.” Here is no possible chance of error; this is deliberate perversion of the facts to serve Gary Giuffré’s hypothesis. He never corrected this point, though he had known the facts for at least five years.

I have in hand copies of correspondence between Brian P. Champlin (Bpchamplin@aol.com) and Gary Giuffré (ggiuffre@phoenix.net) dated Friday 16 July 1999 18:05:33.

Dear Gary,

Unfortunately I am unable to report that Mgr. Pietro Santoro was the Secretary of the 1958 Conclave. That office was filled by Albertus Di Jorio

... On page 769 of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* for 1958, after the election of Cardinal Masella as Camerlengo is noted, it is stated: ... “The same Fathers elected the most excellent Lord Albert di Jorio as Secretary of the Conclave.” (end of quotation)

Then followed a complete list of the 1958 Conclavist clergy, demonstrating that no Santoro, neither Pietro nor Vincenzo, the Secretary of the 1939 Conclave (who probably died in 1943) had graced the 1958 Conclave with his presence.

Giuffré replied: “Dear Brian: Just saw your e-mail above at 6 P.M. Friday. ... just wanted you to know that I did not lose your letter and will read it carefully later. Thanks for all your detective work on Msgr. Santoro—what a mystery!”

What a hypocrite!

Among the relevant photocopies in my possession are page 877, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 1958, certifying the election of Angelo Joseph Roncalli, signed by Conclave Secretary A. Di Jorio, and page 122, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 1939, certifying the election of Eugenius Pacelli, signed by Conclave Secretary Vincentius Santoro.

These are freely available to all researchers and investigators. Can we believe them beyond the ken or capacity of such a demon researcher and selective citationist as Gary Giuffré? On the contrary, I believe him capable of anything. And slanting it!

Is it any wonder that Gary Giuffré panicked? The only way to continue to hide his own deliberate incompetence was to control the investigation. Now it might slip out of his hands! The quickest, surest method to keep control—to save his own hide—was to destroy the credibility of all those whom he considered threats to his control. Never mind that he had impeded genuine progress for fifteen years; he would greatly discredit and impede any of our current or future plans to recover our Catholic Church. He would complain that we had accomplished nothing, while restraining us by promises of early results, after the proven fashion of Marcel Lefebvre.

Two ladies have chided me for uncharitableness toward Mr. Giuffré. One even subsequently went out of her way to slander Silvio, of whom she knows nothing except by way of reports from Gary Giuffré, that inexhaustible well of verbal venom, which, he seems to think, covers a plenitude of fraud. Gary holds no animus against me, he says, for the things he has said and done against me and mine. But I can’t afford silence. Charity does not apply. The sooner that all traditional Catholics realize that Gary is a full-time menace to all our goals, the better.

I must confess that I have been remiss in failing to deal earlier with this problem. Perhaps I may yet alter our course toward effectiveness. Maybe songs or slogans will help. One comes immediately to mind: Belly up in Bellville!

Edward Noyes Westcott, a banker who died in 1898, left us a posthumous novel, *David Harum*. David, a paragon of Yankee ingenuity and aphorisms, was famous for adherence to the Golden Rule: “Do unto others as they would do unto you, but do it first!”

As you may have read, or deduced, David was an extremely successful businessman, and legal to the core. Gary Giuffré apparently hoped to provide posthumous proof of his Siridiocy, to solve all the Church's problems without personal or financial risk. As we have shown, Gary was an extremely selective investigator who thought to cover the fact that he covered facts. He tried to do to us what he expected we would do to him when the facts came to light. He surely did it first. He thus aroused suspicion, which provoked closer examination of his illegal inaction—rotten to the corps!

I had hoped to discontinue a distasteful subject, but the liars will not let it drop. With regard to the story that Msgr. Santoro smuggled out a statement that the smoke from the Sistine Chapel on October 26, 1958 was white, whereas Msgr. Santoro, having died years earlier, was not in the 1958 Conclave, Gary Giuffré pleaded that the translators deceived him. But they translated what Gary had furnished. They never saw the original article as it appeared in the Italian press. They all trusted Gary to present the facts, just as I had trusted him until I saw his evidence. After seventeen years of "investigation" he had proved absolutely nothing except his own bad faith and incompetence. He had kept us from the truth, and from those who could have informed us. He had wasted fifteen years of irrecoverable opportunity.

Even worse, he saddled with calumny those of us who had exposed his fraud, especially a man who had worked like a beaver to help in his investigations and done everything asked of him for over eight years. Silvio Mattacchione has been charged with master-minding, and even writing, **The War Is Now!** This makes almost as much sense as the other lies, such as that Silvio is now a Judaizer (who wormed his way into Gary's good graces by helping financially when Gary's son needed treatment. Why should Gary repay a Judaizer? Especially out of the \$100,000 donated more than a year ago to Gary to re-roof St. Jude's?) I exposed Gary's ineptitude in *The War Is Now!* #64. Only in #66 did I charge deliberate deception. Gary had cut his own throat with the violence of his reaction to #64, which reaction had driven Silvio to check the original source. This differed essentially from the version which Gary had asked him to translate.

What makes Silvio a Judaizer? He knows the editor of the magazine, **Inside the Vatican**.

Gary's long-time friend, Jim Condit, Jr., Emailed Atila Guimaraes: "I am concerned that Silvio Mattacchione not be allowed to run free among traditional-minded Catholics holding himself forth as a sedevacantist, unless such Catholics also know that he is an intimate friend and collaborator of the publisher of 'Inside the Vatican' magazine, Dr Robert Moynihan. ... while some may feel that 'Inside the Vatican' passes muster as a conservative Catholic magazine, many others (including me) look at 'Inside the Vatican' as a cutting edge instrument of deception wielded on behalf of Judaizers operating today within Catholic circles."

Mr. Condit then cites two horrible examples of Judaizing in the pages of *Inside the Vatican*. I shall cite the second. "... attempted use of the uncompromising reputation of Mr. Hutton Gibson to soften up gullible readers to the idea of compromising on Catholic tradition now that we are presented with the opportunity of 'this new pontificate' ... 'The "Siri Thesis" unravels', February 2006 issue, ITV. ... on the authority of ... Dr. Leonard Giblin ... that Silvio Mattacchione was ... responsible for arranging the interview of Mr. Hutton Gibson by ITV ..."

[Interview? I authorized quotation of my published statements. The editor could treat them as he pleased.]

"After ITV correctly relates that Mr. Hutton Gibson has now changed his one-time favorable view of the Siri Thesis as a possible explanation for the present Church crisis, and that now Mr. Gibson does not view it as a plausible explanation, we read this disingenuous paragraph:

"'If this is the perspective of the most radical of the Catholic traditionalists, there seems room for guarded optimism about the possibility of coming to some sort of meeting of the minds over the questions which most trouble Catholic traditionalists, involving the changes in the Church's liturgy and in her rites of ordination of priests and consecration of bishops. In this new pontificate, the time may have come for traditional Catholics and "conciliar Rome" to "reason together" to find a way forward in a complex and confusing world.' ...

"Uggh! This is the language of modernists, Judiazers (sic), destroyers, and deceivers. If the writings of Mr. Hutton Gibson in his books and newsletters over the past 25 [33?] years are any guide, there is NO WAY that he is in a mood to sit down and bargain with Benedict XVI regarding the tradition of the Roman Catholic Church. Yet this is the impression that Robert Moynihan and his staff are clearly intending to leave ... under the pretext of providing Hutton Gibson a platform to make known his repudiation of the Siri Thesis, ITV tries then to make the unsupportable jump to leave the impression with readers that Mr. Gibson is considering abandoning his life long attempt" [Is that all?] "to stand uncompromisingly for the traditions of the Church, so that he can temporize with the 'new pontificate' ..."

This proves Silvio a Judaizer? **How?**

When anyone tells you about Silvio's misdeeds, ask how well he knows Silvio (*if* he knows him). Silvio is straighter than a plumbline. Only Gary Giuffré can benefit from this organized slander against Silvio. Gary

fondly imagines that it can restore his own credibility.

In Gary Giuffrè's Persistence in the Siridiocy he argues that Father Lawrence S. Brey supports him. The following excerpts from Father Brey's letter, 6/26/97, to retired Law Professor Peter Reiss call Gary's reliability into further question.

Dear Peter, ... Regarding GG and the Siri thesis: I had a recent visit with Pat Omlor in Minnetonka ... He had the opportunity to go through Gary's material. His conclusion is basically what mine has been for a long time, though I haven't pushed it as much as I should. In Gary's writings on the Siri thesis there seems to be a lack of evidence, proof, documentation. And there is overabundant recourse to "auxiliary" and "*ad hominem*" arguments which really can't make the case, including visions, apparitions, revelations, and DOVES. I suggested to Pat that he confront Gary with this matter. I will probably again bring it up but then it may look like collusion.

If this thing is a bomb, I hate to be associated with it or be used in its regard. On the other hand, the Pat Omlor thing was ONE, TWO, THREE, BANG, no frills or extraneous argumentation. The reason I suggested that Gary be in touch with Pat on his project was precisely because he could benefit from Pat's input. Particularly since Pat makes darn sure before presenting his case and arguments, that there is a watertight case. Gary should proceed the same way in something as critical as the Siri thing. But he seems to build a big case on what are but shreds of evidence, and a woeful lack of documentation.

Knowing you, I think you would agree on this matter, all the more so as an attorney. As you know I bent over backward to encourage G and his project, but always with the understanding that he presents a strong case. Early on also I emphasized the minimal value of private revelations in such matters. And certainly the whole case cannot be built on such things.

... If anything, any help should be orientated toward unearthing hard evidence. The "old man" Archbishop may be just another illusion, and all the indications are that his interests are not in the Church at large but in his little world of college property, etc. There is also the gnawing question why he (if the "chosen one") made and makes no move to stand forth; just as it remains a gnawing question why Siri himself did or said practically nothing to confirm his election.

It is very possible that we indeed haven't had a pope since Pius XII, and maybe are destined to have none any more, that maybe time is truly unwinding and Christ may soon come to wrap things up. How the usurpers got in there may be as simple as their "election" by majorities that were no longer Catholic, in which case there would be no need for some external "irregularity" to produce the usurpers.

Sincerely in Christ

For at least nine years Father Brey has not supported Gary or his baseless hypothesis. Coincidentally, perhaps, Father Brey has not graced St. Jude's Shrine with his presence. He has probably not been invited; if you disagree with Gary on any issue whatsoever, you are his enemy forever. Gary will no doubt take him to task for reversing his stand "180 degrees," as he has accused others who also on closer examination of his "evidence" have changed their minds.

Gary contends that his "intellectual property" has been stolen, presumably to publish. He has not himself published because he has not found the "smoking gun." He has not proved his case in seventeen years (of investigation?). He thinks that no one may consult his sources because he saw them first, and no one may consult other plentiful sources because, despite availability, he never consulted them.

Caught with both hands right up to the scapula in the till, he distracts with personal attacks on those who caught him, as though they had committed some felony. His "intellectual property" became public property when he showed his slide lecture, which he lengthened *ad nauseam* with time and money that he could well have devoted to investigation.

Not only has he defamed those who exposed his behavior, he has threatened some (but not me) with legal action. Among those threatened was Kathleen Plumb, for copying my first article of **The War Is Now!** #66, December 2005, in which I exposed Gary's "investigation," in her 16-page tabloid, **The Four Marks**. She publishes all sides, and lets readers choose their own. I shudder to think what Gary and his legal brother will do to her for subsequently printing Ray Antonini's Letter to the Editor and Leonard Giblin's article.

Does Gary not, in continuing to promote the Siridiocy, admit his connection with the Santoro hoax, suppression of Prince Chigi's official white smoke explanation from the Vatican, and the Scortesco impossibility?

Fax message from Fr. Lawrence S. Brey, 5/15/06, to Silvio Mattacchione: URGENT

I MEANT TO FAX THIS SOONER BUT MISPLACED YOUR NUMBER, I understand that a paper or letter of mine of 1990 endorsing the alleged election of CARDINAL G. SIRI as pope "Gregory XVII" on Oct. 26, 1958, was uploaded on website of David Hobson. I would like EMPHATICALLY to make it known that said article or letter does not reflect my current understanding of the matter; and I don't think it was uploaded with my permission. Since my views have since been modified, I wish to request that this inclusion and what it reflects, is not today relevant and I would like it expunged from said website.

I would like this made abundantly clear to Mr D. Hobson, and would like my inclusion deleted from his website, as not representing my current thinking. Since the writing of that letter or article, I have had further insights on the matter, and feel there are grounds for misgivings regarding the Siri- Pope thesis. Since my health and other factors make it difficult for me to pursue this matter as much as I should, I leave it to you, dear Silvio, to undertake this retraction on my behalf.

Sincerely in Christ, (signed) Fr. Lawrence S. Brey

Father Brey admits that he received a visit from David Hobson, but says that Hobson spoke too fast to be understood. I can attest to Hobson's tachyphasia. It overwhelms understanding of his victim's message. He made a big deal of both Silvio's and my trying to deter his public espousal of the Siridiocy. He took our calls as threats. We intended only to save him from unnecessarily making a fool of himself.

What accounts for Gary's unequal treatment of two sets of unsupported, self-contradictory testimonies from Malachi Martin and Fr. Khoat? Malachi gave Gary inconsistent accounts of a papal election, therefore Gary tagged Malachi all kinds of liar and traitor. But Father Khoat pulled a swifty on Gary and dashed off to interview Cardinal Siri, for five minutes. He reported back to Gary and two priests, Msgr. Raymond Ruscitto and Father Alex Thevervelil. According to Gary, the interview:

"What can I do for you Father?" asked Siri.

In his broken French, Fr. Khoat said: "I believe that you are the true Pope."

Siri stated emphatically, "I am not the Pope."

Fr. Khoat responded immediately: "But it is now known in America that you were elected Pope but were prevented from governing the Church. I represent many people in the United States who believe you are the Pope."

"I am not the Pope. The Pope is here in Rome. I am not the Pope," said Siri.

"You may not be the Pope *de facto* (in fact), but *de iure* (in law), you are the Pope."

"I am not the Pope. I met your bishop during the council."

[This is as far as Father Khoat reported, on July 22, 1988]

"Yes, and after my bishop returned to Vietnam, he was killed by the Communists. And because you failed to do your duty, and did not consecrate Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, my country fell to the Communists!"

Fr. Khoat noticed that Siri's eyes had begun to well up. He pleaded: "Are you not the true Pope?"

"You already know it," said Siri.

[A strange priest, speaking broken French, in five minutes extracts this world-shaking admission from a man who had never suggested such an idea to his closest friends for thirty years! "Siri's eyes had begun to well up." May I suggest that Siri had rolled his eyes to heaven in frustration and said in effect: "Since you know I'm pope, I must indeed be pope." He thereupon proceeded to say and do everything possible to satisfy this fanatic so that he would leave.]

"Then, Holiness, you must come with me at once to the airport and board a flight with me to America, where you will be able to speak openly about your pontificate."

Hurriedly, Siri instructed Fr. Khoat: "Come back here at eight o'clock tonight—my secretary will be gone then."

Gary's comment: "His follow-up meeting with Siri was to occur in less than 12 hours, and it would be crucial that language barriers not hamper his next conversation with the hidden Pope."

Fr. Khoat tracked down Msgr. Taramasso, who accompanied him back to Rome to see Siri. They arrived at 8 p.m. for a meeting of about one hour. Two days later, on 16 June 1988, Fr. Khoat had one final private encounter with Siri just before his departure to Houston. Siri said to his secretary: "If that Vietnamese priest shows up here again, send him away."

Then, says Gary, "Fr. Khoat committed one of the most inexplicable acts of his 1988 Italian odyssey. He marched into the Vatican ... met ... an assistant to John Paul II. ... hand[ed] the priest a \$1000 bribe, ... was lead (sic) to a hallway ... until Wojtyla came through ... he called out 'What about the consecration of Russia?'"

"Only after Siri was dead, did Fr. Khoat begin to reveal to me the rest of what had transpired during his three meetings with the Pope-in-exile. On 5 May 1989, Fr. Khoat finally confirmed that Siri knew he was the Pope. ... Only then did he inform me about Msgr. Taramasso, and about his going with him to see Siri."

[Taramasso was also dead.]

"What did Siri tell you and Fr. Taramasso during that meeting, Father?" asked Gary.

Fr. Khoat replied, "The 'Old Man' said, 'If anything happens to me, elect a Pope at once.'"

"How could you and Msgr. Taramasso elect a Pope? Did he name you both cardinals in secret?"

"Yes," answered Fr. Khoat. ...

"Do you have a letter from Siri, naming you as one of his cardinals?"

"No," he said, "But God will show us the way."

Leaving aside the inescapable conclusion that one of Father Khoat's stories directly contradicted the other,

does not the suspicious aroma of lunacy arise from both?

Malachi Martin told Gary Giuffré conflicting stories and was targeted as the lowest type liar.

Father Khoat told Gary Giuffré conflicting stories and became a chief witness to Siri's papacy.

Father Ted Bradley announced his Mass intention for the second Sunday after Epiphany: for Gary Giuffré! – said to be in mortal danger from his former close associate of eight years. Silvio Mattacchione, it seems, is a spy for Ratzinger, Mafia chief, senior KGB operative, and a Hell's Angel, whether simultaneously or by turns. It's high time for a different comedy. What a use for the Mass! Silvio's slanderers all cite or quote Gary Giuffré, of whom no one remembers when he last spoke the unslanted truth.

Comment from the Target

I just can not believe that one person sitting in Canada can be the source of all of this turmoil? How can this be? Realistically how can people repeat these insane stories that I am a KGB active agent, involved with Hell's Angels, a member of the Mob, a secret Jew or Marrano, a Judaizer, a paid spy for Ratzinger, a paid spy for Monsignor Braschi, a Vatican destroyer of Traditional Catholics' Faith, a druggie of pigeons, a fraud, a person guilty of identity theft, and much more. Will I soon be declared a freemason and finally no doubt a Satanist? How much more ridiculous must the accusations get before people wake up to what is really going on?

Remember, hard as it is to believe, that this is only part of what I do. In between all of the above I must put wood in my outdoor furnace three times every day or watch my family freeze to death, feed and water my pigeons twice per day or watch them starve, clean the snow from my driveway, help home-school my Down Syndrome daughter, help my two children in University, and my daughter in high school, and then, as time permits, do my regular job to try and make a living. [In 1999, e. g., he reprinted all Patrick Omlor's works under one cover, **The Robber Church.**]

Yet those that repeat and pass on these stories have itchy ears; they love what is going on; it need make no sense so long as it is drama, invented by certified drama queens. They have all shown themselves a faithless generation with no love of truth, let alone charity. So it continues, the calumny of my name by phone, by fax, by email, and on websites, and I do not retaliate. ...

Silvio Mattacchione

[If these liars had anything on Silvio, they would not be driven to fabricate these often mutually exclusive fantasies.]

Another Target

For his mental condition Gary Giuffré absolutely requires total agreement. Should any disagree with him they are in his encyclopedic bad books forever. He threatened Kathleen Plumb, editor and publisher of **The Four Marks**, with a lawsuit for publishing a letter I had written. He gave her the chance to avoid legal entanglement by publishing a letter of apology which he had concocted in his inimitable deathless verbosity, to overflow an entire issue of her sixteen-page paper. When she declined his offer, Jim Condit, Jr. tried to persuade her that publishing Gary's apology to himself would be preferable to legal defense and costs. Gary can secure publication for his output only with cash in hand.

Then others who have written for **The Four Marks** report attempted dissuasion from further contributions thereto. How will such tactics help to our goal, the return of our traditional Catholic Church? Will it introduce Gary to normalcy? Will even that help the Church? Will it even roof his church?

It is said that in court a successful lawyer never asks a question to which he doesn't know the answer. When I asked what happened to the \$100,000 given Gary to roof his church, I knew the answer. But all Gary sniveled was: "I've been hit again!" He has lost his sanctimony license. Let him quit milking sympathy for years of criminal behavior and answer, at least, that last question.

What will he devise? Will he hide behind mortal danger? Has he been "hit again?"

Robert Moynihan's *Inside the Vatican* carried two pages in its February issue entitled *The "Siri Thesis" Unravels*. Among the hard facts reported therein were several lines (in the first four following Objections) that require comment.

Objection—In traditional Catholic circles many have become so confused, frustrated, and embittered by developments in Catholicism since the Second Vatican Council that they have come to oppose the Council itself, and even the hierarchy that has almost universally preached that Vatican II brought a "new pringtime" to the Church. Some oppose even the popes subsequent to Pius XII, and are on the verge of a break with Rome.

Reply—"Developments in Catholicism since the Second Vatican Council" is as fine a euphemism for heresies as I have seen. Catholics necessarily oppose these and their sources, especially the Council itself,

the hierarchy which preached so mendaciously, and the five usurpers of the papacy since Pius XII. Catholics may feel frustrated over the current absurd situation, but we are not confused. We realize that to maintain ties with nineteen centuries of the Catholic Church we must refuse to recognize half a century of these “developments.”

Objection—On the internet we find at least a dozen or two small groups of self-designated Catholics that follow various self-proclaimed “Popes.”

Reply—Some of these groups may be frustrated and/or confused in their reactions, but all agree on the fact that there has been no genuine pope in Rome for some time.

Objection—Scattered worldwide are communities grouped around aging traditional priests to celebrate the traditional Mass, maintaining no formal connection with Rome.

Reply—“Aging” is common to us all, and is part of the job description. Catholics prefer priests old enough to have been properly ordained, that we may eschew idolatry.

Objection—Severely fewer Catholics attend Mass, enter the religious life, believe in the real presence, etc., since Vatican II. This does not mean that many good things may not also be happening, some “under the surface”—nor that worse might not have happened, had there been no Vatican II.

Reply—Perhaps not, but it surely passes belief. What great benefit could compensate for the nearly universal loss of Mass, sacraments, and schools? Were not the hundred thousand priests who quit when their jobs were abolished replaced with protected sexual perverts? Has dialogue not driven out doctrine, authority, and missionary activity? Who, even in catacombs and submarines, teaches and baptizes all nations? What does the New Church teach even its own? What is the purpose of the postconciliar “Church” except destruction of all Catholic dogma and tradition?

Objection—Some Catholics have grown so frustrated and confused by the shifting trends in the postconciliar Church that they have latched onto various “conspiracy theories” to explain what has happened.

Reply—So it would seem. There is really no accounting for tastes. But one thing is certain: the current situation could not have come about by accident. The Church has become the victim of a highly organized, successful conspiracy. It would surely gratify us to pin down the details, but the result is visible to all, and was Scripturally predicted. It must be judged and rejected on its visible fruits. Rejected! Not “reasoned together” with the successful conspirators.

Objection—But has the failure of the Siri theory not destroyed the basis for the sedevacantist position?

Reply—How? What is different? Can we not continue to cite the same heresies of the Second Vatican Council and their “papal” promulgations which we had quoted for more than twenty years before encountering that baseless hypothesis?

Objn—Unless the Siri theory is true, Christ has failed His promise to be with His Church all days.

Reply—Or else you’re off your rocker. What an exegete you are! Almost any other fool can plainly see that His promise is contingent upon His Church’s preaching His Gospel—not the gospel of Judas—to the entire world. Who officially preaches His Gospel these days? To whom?

Query—Has Gary Giuffré reacted to your criticism?

Reply—With his characteristic excess of unnecessary words and inconsequential arguments. He pretends to believe that exposure of his hidden perfidy is more criminal than the perfidy itself. He cannot deny the charges, so he blackens the names of those who found him out.

Fact—He continued to promote his theory with argument based on “information” which he had known false for at least five years. Throughout this period he continued to accept financial support for the purpose of investigating its truth.

Objection—But should we not take advantage of positive results of his research?

Reply—Obviously you have never read his deathless prose or seen his soporific slide lecture. Neither contains the slightest shadow of conviction. In hundreds of overblown pages he has proven nothing that can support his amazing hypothesis. His method pursues only those facts or fictions which tend to promote his predetermined conclusion. And we have seen that only by misrepresentation can he adduce even such items to be seen in that light.

Objection—Was he not misled by incompetent translators?

Reply—On the contrary, he misled the translators, none of whom saw the original documents but only the bowdlerized versions which he furnished them. He might even have gotten away with it, because everyone took it for granted that he was genuinely interested in the truth. But he reacted to the fact that his greatest supporter was almost coerced into an expedition of genuine inquiry and investigation in such an inexplicable way that the calumniated greatest supporter was driven in self-defense to investigate the original sources, which Gary had deliberately withheld from him and all other translators. And these original sources sank Gary. Bear in mind also that prior to his exposure as a fraud, I had read Gary’s entire unprinted book, and assayed it as inadequate, irrelevant, and worthless, even before Silvio Mattacchione discovered it a deliberate fraud.

Gary pretends that *Inside the Vatican* has never before mentioned the Siri theory, even at times with favor, and could therefore have no reason to publish contrary evidence in the interests of accurate reporting. By demonstrating that Santoro (in 1939) sent a message out of the Conclave when needed, Gary shows that a similar situation could well have produced another message in 1958 if needed. So he *invented* another message from a dead Santoro. Why? Because no similar situation, to which he could attach a plausible argument, had occurred.

Though Gary claims to have refrained from mention of Santoro on the internet, he certainly discussed him in published Email correspondence. Is it not at least a trifle suspicious that all who have brought up Santoro could have received their “mistranslation” only from the man who had himself never mentioned Santoro? Gary even searched my books attempting to impute dishonesty to me for changing my mind on the basis of deeper investigation. So he “quotes” men whom he had deliberately deceived by withholding information, as though we were at fault. He found these:

“I believe that Cardinal Siri is the man whose election was confirmed ‘in all certainty’ and that his pontificate has been suppressed.” – *The Enemy Is Still Here!*, page 128. This quotation has been imputed to me, to show my inconsistency. This is typical of my accuser, who cites the line from my book without disclosing that it was written (in a five-page article) by a Guest—who has since changed his view, and who had based his quoted opinion upon assurances from Gary himself.

But Gary missed:

“I have seen (1991) Gary Giuffrè’s ten-hour slide lecture. It is virtually certain that we had a pope, most likely Cardinal Siri, who was probably also elected twice since.” – *The Enemy Is Here!*, page 338. These words are mine; Gary was, I thought, in earnest pursuit of his subject. Having read the long record of dilatory efforts toward no substantial conclusion I rejected his thesis and motives. I regret the time wasted. At least I can get on with the war, *sans* Sirious baggage.

Gary alleged that he and I had differed, not over his mistranslation of an infallible document, but over a passage from the Spirago-Clarke Catechism (English). In his April abbreviated slide lecture he indeed substituted the catechism passage for the mistranslated infallible statement. I would not have wasted time on a catechism passage, hardly an infallible authority, certainly not in need of translation. General Councils of the Catholic Church have always been extremely careful and specific in their infallible canons. How they arrived at these canons is hardly relevant.

Gary charged that I had obtained his book without his permission. He had agreed to send the book himself, but had no time off the phone. I belong to the group formed to expedite publication—a group entitled to see what it promotes. To steal something, one must deem it worth stealing.

I have neither time nor space to parse Gary’s rebuttal—a classic tutorial in warping and misrepresentation—nor to waste on the endless absurdities in his deceived translator’s excuses, which would seem to show either that Gary had furnished incomplete matter to be translated or her own utter incompetence.

Now for an amazing correction. I don’t believe it either. But I heard recently of a man who says that Siri told him that Malachi Martin was pope. If Siri was “bound by the secret,” he was either drunk or joking. Or else the real Siri was down in the Vatican dungeon. Remember, you heard it here first.

* * * * *

If you want your children to fight for their Faith, send them to public school; to lose their Faith, to Catholic school. -- Fulton Sheen

Prospects: Ecclesiastical? Current signs suggest a brakeless, downhill race to apocalyptic disaster.

Prospects: Political? An election staged without issues or candidates, decided by programmed voting machines, without discernible change or improvement.

Prospects: Financial? A rigged crisis designed to promote apparent collapse of the entire system, to achieve completion of our creeping (galloping?) mass enslavement.

This financial aspect of our problems has an inordinate bearing on the political and ecclesiastical aspects. And therein may lie a workable solution. Let me suggest the plan outlined on website taxretirement.com, designed to save us from tyrannical, predatory government by returning the use of our own money.

* * * * *

Page 4 of the October 19 bulletin of St. George parish, 304 Crockett St., George West, Texas:

“Why must each nationality have its own Mass? Our parish used to be united. Now we have Filipino Catholics, Vietnamese Catholics, and Mexican Catholics, all with their own Masses and activities. Why can’t we be just Catholic?”

Rose”

“Dear Rose,

“The word catholic [decapitalized] means whole, universal, complete. To be Catholic we must include everyone.

“I once served as pastor of the only Catholic parish in a town of 20,000 people, more than half of whom were Catholic. The 17 Baptist churches included a First Southern with services only in English, a First Baptist with services only in English, a First Baptist with services only in Spanish, and a Southern Baptist with services only in Spanish.

“The Catholic Church goes out of its way to make sure that never happens to us and that all [except Rose?] feel a part of the Catholic Church. One way to make a person feel welcome is to offer Mass in his or her native language [especially if the man speaks English and his wife Spanish and the son’s wife Vietnamese], which is why my parish offered Mass in Spanish and Vietnamese as well as in English. We had a Sunday evening Mass to accommodate the schedule of the many people who worked on Sunday mornings. And we also had events that brought the whole parish together [so they couldn’t converse]. The result was that we had six weekend Masses rather than six different communities.” [How did he cope with weekday masses?]

“It is difficult to form one Church. It is difficult to be Catholic. But for 2000 [vernacular?] years we have found it to be worth it.

Patrick Keyes, C. Ss. R.”

[That must be why I felt so unwelcome at forty years of Latin Mass. It was those ushers yelling “Ave” and trying to find seats for late-comers.]

* * * * *

The War Is Now! #76

G. K. Chesterton was born into Calvinism, which his sunny disposition and good sense rejected. He spent years, he writes, constructing his own ideal religion, and when it was done he discovered that it was the Catholic religion. I was saved all this trouble by the good sense of my ancestors. But as I was instructed in Catholicism over the years I came to appreciate its perfection. Chesterton would have buried the postconciliar “church” in mirth even before Vatican II ended, but he has left the job to us. Let us not hesitate!

I put four years in the World War Two army. Most of my spare time went into arguing religion. I never lost an argument, largely because of the inadequacy of the opposition. I realized that despite my Catholic instruction, including a seminary high school, I simply lacked enough knowledge. So I read Father Walter Farrell’s *A Companion to the Summa*. He led me painlessly through all St. Thomas Aquinas’ theology. I studied many of God’s attributes and perfections, though neither I nor Farrell nor Aquinas would dare to presume that we had covered them all. What created mind could comprehend its Creator?

I was led through God’s clearly demonstrated omnipotence, whereby He created all that we can see or comprehend, His benevolence whereby He loves what He creates (though not necessarily how we have improved it), and His justice, which is best demonstrated in Christ’s Crucifixion. What struck me most was the seeming contrast between God’s most perfect, permanently effective, irresistible Will and human free will which too often has the foolhardiness to oppose the Divine Will.

The truth that was driven home to me—for the first time, despite all those years in the Catholic education system—was the seriousness of sin. Every sin results from the unwarrantable preference for our own puny free will over God’s Will.

Who do we think we are? Freedom is not only not justification; it can get us damned!

* * * * *

Our Catholic education instruction manuals, as stated above, seldom if ever explicated the direct opposition between the human and divine wills involved in every temptation to sin, though they clearly implied it. They omitted as well the deadly menace cloaked in the public beneficence of Freemasonry. My father’s generation understood this well. But our school system could well have warned us.

* * * * *

God created us all. If He wanted us all identical, He could have stopped with Adam. None of us had the choice of parentage or race. Discrimination for color or race is stupid. But other reasons for discrimination are built or educated into us. I would not go for a meal with a man who habitually blows smoke in my face

or kicks the waiter. I tend to avoid militant atheists. I would not accept employment in a leper colony. Should you wish to infer that I would not frequent the haunts of sodomites, feel free. I have the right to choose my company, and to protect both my health and my reputation.

When I go to church I have an absolute right to the real Mass celebrated by a real priest. This is my obligation, and I must fulfil it. I have no right to accept a substitute for either merely because either condition is unavailable. These conditions were imposed by God Himself. I cannot compromise what belongs to God. So why am I a terrorist? Obviously this term far better fits those who have stolen my ordinary means of salvation.

These thieves who have conspired to deprive the ordinary Catholic of his opportunity to worship God as He prescribed, and even more foully to deprive God of His due worship, obviously oppose God and His established Catholic Church. They have demonstrated that they work according to a well-organized plan. They have a common allegiance, to a creature or creatures in rebellion against their Creator. How they expect to be rewarded escapes me. Or is it reward enough to kill the Catholic Church and make salvation infinitely more difficult for its adherents? The very scope of the plot, its near universality, and its chief objective, to thwart God's Will, suffice to identify the moving spirit, our oldest enemy, Lucifer.

At a racetrack would you back with your soul's salvation a horse that had finished last in his only race? If you perceived the situation as above described, would you not be obliged in charity to all mankind to expose and denounce all aspects of this plot, and to strive to frustrate it?

Suppose impossibly that Lucifer could succeed, he would not thereby escape hell. He has nothing to gain. He is motivated solely by hatred. Revenge against God is impossible, so he attacks God's creatures.

* * * * *

St. Patrick's feast has come and gone again.

But he himself has never left. He came first as a slave, but returned as the quintessential apostle-missionary to this people whom Chesterton had "eulogized" (Ballad of the White Horse) as the great Gaels of Ireland whom God created mad, for all their wars are merry, and all their songs are sad. This seems to me the clearest common sense.

St. Patrick devoted his entire life to the conversion of this well-disposed people, and succeeded to such an extent that Irish missionaries converted the hordes of barbarians which engulfed the Roman Empire. And this spirit still motivates us. No one wants to be alone. We all want to see our friends and acquaintances—and everyone else—in heaven. Catacombs may suit some, but the joy of true (missionary) Catholicism must be shared. It is far too great to keep to ourselves.

It can be shared only in its original entirety. Christ commissioned his Apostles teachers. They never sought out the heads of false sects for negotiation—as do the contemporary ecumenical substitutes for the Catholic Church—to accommodate futile pursuit of salvation—to compromise God's truth as though it belonged to them. Clerical failure to fulfil the duty to obey Christ's final mandate cannot concern us. We still adhere to an essentially missionary Church—to which St. Patrick converted us.

We appreciate to the extent of our human limitations the utter reason found among religions only in Catholicism. In addition we find in such Old Testament revelations as the Books of Isaias, Daniel, and Wisdom, prophecies which Jesus Christ fulfilled to the letter, and which could never have been fulfilled at any time since. We read in the Acts of the Apostles the enthusiastic reaction to His Message at its first presentation to a crowd wholly Jewish in religion, which also saw in Him the fulfillment of all their prophecies.

Then we turn to the reaction of the Temple authorities—who had provided for and received absolute proof of Christ's Resurrection from the dead—equally absolute rejection. Then we couple this with Christ's most solemn words at His Ascension (Mark 16:16): Go ye into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned.

These are God's own words; shall we not believe them? We must conclude that the Temple authorities—and all who followed them in rejection of Christ—were damned.

This is unbearable! All these generous, quick-witted, artistic friends will go to hell? All the flowers of the field to the incinerator? All these natural comedians will wail in torture for eternity? And we are to discuss with them how we may accommodate the religion that will have accomplished this horror? What course can we take in conscience or in charity except to try to convert them to Catholicism?

Some one forwarded the **Southern Poverty Law Center's list of anti-Semitic organizations**. Behold, in their very midst is listed our Alliance for Catholic Tradition. SPLC charges that, in addition to the accusation of embracing anti-semitism, that all-embracing hate crime, our theology is typically rejected by the Vatican and mainstream Catholics in general. The Vatican's current loose theology conforms to and continues to implement the documents of the Second Vatican Council, as far as innovation can be fraudulently imposed. To represent this deformation of doctrine as theology is both reprehensible and irresponsible.

Anyone who queries Vatican II can't be all bad. It is detestable for any number of good reasons, ranging from outright condemned heresy (e.g., that all religions are salvific) through illogicality to mere boring obfuscation of well-known doctrine.

If, however, we are presented as anti-Semitic for rejection of the Second Vatican Council, it would seem to follow that the Second Vatican Council is pro-semitic in its theology. Now this entails self-contradiction insofar as the Second Vatican Council claims to speak for the Catholic Church. The Church, having established the status and content of the Bible, is incompetent to retract or to reinterpret it, in particular the historical content of the New Testament.

When Judas returned those thirty pieces of silver paid him to betray Jesus Christ, the Temple authorities could not return them to the Temple treasury:

St. Matthew's Gospel 27:3. Then Judas, who betrayed him, seeing that he was condemned, repenting himself, brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and ancients, 4. Saying: I have sinned in betraying innocent blood. But they said: What is that to us? Look thou to it. 5. And casting down the pieces of silver in the temple, he departed and went and hanged himself with an halter. 6. But the chief priests having taken the pieces of silver [unthinkable to leave them for the sweeper!], said: It is not lawful to put them into the corbona, because it is the price of blood. 7. And after they had consulted together, they bought with them the potter's field, to be a burying place for strangers. 8. For this cause that field was called Haceldama, that is, the field of blood, even to this day.

What is this but the clearest possible acknowledgment of the chief priests' and ancients' intentional involvement in a successful plot to kill Jesus Christ?

From the time of Abraham the Jews treasured the prophecies of their Messiah. They knew the time and the place of His coming. They knew where to direct the Magi. They knew exactly what He meant in saying (John 8:58): Amen, amen, I say to you, before Abraham was made, I AM—as shown by (8:59): They took up stones therefore to cast at him—for blasphemy.

The Temple authorities even set up a guard to witness Christ's Resurrection, then bought the soldiers' silence. They had to be thoroughly convinced of the fact, or they would not have paid off, but in despair resulting from ignorance, or proud refusal, of God's infinite mercy, they denied the obvious facts, and thereby denied salvation to their adherents, descendants, and proselytes.

But now the descendants of the non-Semitic proselytes charge any traditional Catholic with the crime of anti-semitism, nearly always committed by the aforementioned non-Semitic proselytes against Near East Arabs, mostly Semitic descendants of Abraham. Traditionally, Catholics have always hated heresies but not heretics, error but not the erring. In our books, the first and worst heresy is post-Christian Judaism, first held by the Jews who rejected the fulfillment of their own immemorial prophecies. Christ said: (Mark 16:16) "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned." Are we to believe Him or the descendants of the condemned who lie under the same prospect. If we cannot convert them, they will probably go to hell. We cannot convert them if they can prevent us from professing our faith in Christ, which profession somehow violates their Semitic rights.

We appreciate, however, the truth of SPLC's charge that the Vatican rejects our theology, as held by the Catholic Church for nineteen centuries. We rather suspect that the Vatican has received far more than thirty pieces of silver.

We doubt that the SPLC has directly contributed financially to the replacement for the Catholic Church. The SPLC and its elusive prowling spirit, Morris Dees, contribute more to our civil rights by such obviously beneficial activities as removal of the Ten Commandments (passed on by the Semites) from the Alabama Supreme Court building in which the SPLC occupies office space.

Meanwhile we hear from several sources that Morris Dees and his SPLC once defended the rights of members of the Ku Klux Klan. This gives us hope that traditional Catholics, to whom our "Church" grants

neither rights nor hearing, can call upon those sterling, effective, diligent defenders of the downtrodden, Morris Dees and his SPLC.

Man in white yarmilke write with forked computer.

Dear Brothers in the Episcopal Ministry!

An unforeseen [I'll bet!] mishap for me was the fact that the Williamson case came on top of the remission of the excommunication. The discreet gesture of mercy towards four Bishops ordained validly [according to this invalidly ordained "bishop" of Rome] but not legitimately suddenly appeared [was staged?] as something completely different: as the repudiation of [theologically impossible] reconciliation between Christians and Jews, and thus as the reversal of what the [pastoral] Council had laid down in this regard to guide the Church's path. A gesture of reconciliation with an ecclesial group engaged in a process of separation thus turned into its very antithesis: an apparent step backwards with regard to all the steps of reconciliation between Christians and Jews taken since the [openly heretical] Council – steps which my own [unbiased? orthodox?] work as a theologian had sought from the beginning to take part in and support. That this overlapping of two opposed processes took place and momentarily upset peace between Christians and Jews, as well as [non-existent] peace within the Church, is something which I can only deeply deplore. I have been told that consulting the information available on the internet would have made it possible to perceive the problem early on. I have learned the lesson that in the future in the Holy See we will have to pay greater attention to that source of news [and Catholic doctrine]. I was saddened by the fact that even Catholics who, after all, might have had a better knowledge of the situation, thought they had to attack me with open hostility. Precisely for this reason I thank all the more our Jewish friends, who quickly helped to clear up the misunderstanding and to restore the atmosphere of friendship and trust which – as in the days of [last antipope] has also existed throughout my pontificate and, thank God, continues to exist.

The remission of the excommunication of the four Bishops consecrated in 1988 by Archbishop Lefebvre without a mandate of the Holy See has for many reasons caused, both within and beyond the Catholic Church, a discussion more heated than any we have seen for a long time. Many Bishops felt perplexed by an event which came about unexpectedly and was difficult to view positively in the light of the issues and tasks facing the Church today. Even though many Bishops and members of the faithful were disposed in principle to take a positive view of the Pope's concern for reconciliation, the question remained whether such a gesture was fitting in view of the genuinely urgent demands of the life of Faith in our time. Some groups, on the other hand, openly accused the Pope of wanting to turn back the clock to before the Council: as a result, an avalanche of protests was unleashed, whose bitterness laid bare wounds deeper than those of the present moment. I therefore feel obliged to offer you, dear Brothers, a word of clarification, which ought to help you understand the concerns which led me and the competent offices of the Holy See to take this step. In this way I hope to contribute to peace in the Church. [Typical strategy of the postconciliar "Church" —let us create a problem in order to "solve" it.] Another mistake, which I deeply regret, is the fact that the extent and limits of the provision of 21 January 2009 were not clearly and adequately explained at the moment of its publication.

The excommunication affects individuals, not institutions.

An episcopal ordination lacking a pontifical mandate raises the danger of a schism, since it jeopardizes the unity of the [new!] College of Bishops with the [anti] Pope. Consequently the Church must react by employing her most severe punishment – excommunication – with the aim of calling those thus punished to repent and to return to unity. Twenty years after the ordinations, this goal has sadly not yet been attained. [Return to non-existent unity!]

The remission of the excommunication has the same aim as that of the punishment: namely, to invite the four Bishops once more to return.

This gesture was possible once the interested parties had expressed their recognition in principle of the Pope and his authority as Pastor, albeit with some reservations in the area of obedience to his doctrinal authority and to the authority of the Council. Here I return to the distinction between individuals and institutions.. The remission of the excommunication was a measure taken in the field of ecclesiastical discipline: the individuals were freed from the burden of conscience constituted by the most serious of ecclesiastical penalties. This disciplinary level needs to be distinguished from the doctrinal level.

The fact that the Society of St. Pius X does not possess a canonical status in the Church is not, in the end, based on disciplinary but on doctrinal reasons. [Actually, both!] As long as the Society does not have a canonical status in the Church, its ministers do not exercise legitimate ministries in the Church. [He stole our

line!] There needs to be a distinction, then, between the disciplinary level, which deals with individuals as such, and the doctrinal level, at which ministry and institution are involved.

In light of this situation, it is my intention henceforth to join the Pontifical Commission “*Ecclesia Dei*” – the body which has been competent since 1988 for those communities and persons who, coming from the Society of Saint Pius X or from similar groups, wish to return to full communion with the Pope – to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. [From one useless bureaucracy to another.]

This will make it clear that the problems now to be addressed are essentially doctrinal in nature and concern primarily the acceptance of the Second Vatican Council and the post-conciliar magisterium of the Popes [two of our best examples of schism and heresy].

The collegial bodies with which the Congregation studies questions which arise (especially the ordinary Wednesday meeting of Cardinals and the annual or biennial Plenary Session) ensure the involvement of the Prefects of the different Roman Congregations and representatives from the world’s Bishops in the process of decision-making. The Church’s teaching authority cannot be frozen in the year 1962 – this must be quite clear to the Society. But some of those who put themselves forward as great defenders of the Council also need to be reminded that Vatican II embraces [and ignores] the entire doctrinal history of the Church. Anyone who wishes to be obedient to the Council has to accept the faith professed over the centuries [as re-examined, re-interpreted, and accommodated to modern times], and cannot sever the roots from which the tree draws its life. I hope, dear Brothers, that this serves to clarify the positive significance and also the limits of the provision of 21 January 2009. But the question still remains: Was this measure needed? Was it really a priority? Aren’t other things perhaps more important? Of course there are more important and urgent matters. I believe that I set forth clearly the priorities of my pontificate in the addresses which I gave at its beginning. Everything that I said then continues unchanged as my plan of action. The first priority for the Successor of Peter was laid down by the Lord in the Upper Room in the clearest of terms:

“You... strengthen your brothers” (Lk 22:32).

Peter himself formulated this priority anew in his first Letter: "Always be prepared to make a defence to anyone who calls you to account for the Hope that is in you" (1 Pet 3:15). [“being ready always to satisfy every one that asketh you a reason of that hope which is in you.” *Even the translation has been updated.*] 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 women the way to God. [So who and what killed the missionary effort?] Not just any god, but the God who spoke on Sinai; to that God Whose Face we recognize in a Love which presses “to the end” (cf. Jn 13:1) – in Jesus Christ, crucified and risen. The real problem at this moment of our history is that God is disappearing from the human horizon, and, with the dimming of the light [**So what dimmed it if not the Ecumenism of Vatican II and its five implementers?**] which comes from God, humanity is losing its bearings, with increasingly evident destructive effects. Leading men and women to God, to the God who speaks in the Bible: this is the supreme and fundamental priority of the Church and of the Successor of Peter at the present time. A logical consequence of this is that we must have at heart the unity of all believers. Their disunity, their disagreement among themselves, calls into question the credibility of their talk of God. Hence the effort to promote a common witness by Christians to their Faith – ecumenism – is part of the supreme priority. Added to this is the need for all those who believe in God to join in seeking peace, to attempt to draw closer to one another, and to journey together, even with their differing images of God, towards the source of Light – this is interreligious dialogue [disobedience by definition to Christ’s mandatory “Go teach.”]. Whoever proclaims that God is Love “to the end” has to bear witness to Love: in loving devotion to the suffering, in the rejection of hatred and enmity – this is the social dimension of the Christian faith, of which I spoke in the Encyclical *Deus Caritas Est*. <God Is Love>

So if the arduous task of working for Faith, Hope and Love in the world is presently (and, in various ways, always) the Church’s real priority, then part of this is also made up of acts of reconciliation, small and not so small. That the quiet gesture of extending a hand gave rise to a huge uproar, and thus became exactly the opposite of a gesture of reconciliation, is a fact which we must accept. But I ask now: Was it, and is it, truly wrong in this case to meet half-way the brother who "has something against you" (cf. Mt 5:23ff.) and to seek reconciliation? Should not civil society also try to forestall forms of extremism and to incorporate their eventual adherents – to the extent possible – in the great currents shaping social life, and thus avoid their being segregated, with all its consequences? Can it be completely mistaken to work to break down obstinacy and narrowness, and to make space for what is positive and retrievable for the whole? I myself saw, in the years after 1988, how the return of communities which had been separated from Rome changed their interior attitudes; I saw how returning to the bigger and broader Church enabled them to move beyond one-sided positions and broke down rigidity so that positive energies could emerge for the whole. 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? Should we casually let them drift farther from the Church? I think for example of the 491 priests. We cannot know how mixed their motives may be. All the same, I do not think that they would have chosen the priesthood if, alongside various distorted and unhealthy elements, they did not have a love for Christ and a desire to proclaim him and, with him, the living God. Can we simply exclude them, as representatives of a radical fringe, from our pursuit of reconciliation and unity? What would then become of them? [They would probably remain solvent, as the postconciliar aberration faces bankruptcy!]

Certainly, for some time now, and once again on this specific occasion, we have heard from some representatives of that community many unpleasant things – arrogance and presumptuousness, an obsession with one-sided positions, etc. Yet to tell the truth, I must add that I have also received a number of touching testimonials of gratitude which clearly showed an openness of heart. But should not the great Church also allow Herself to be generous in the knowledge of Her great breadth, in the knowledge of the promise [contingent upon her continuing missionary effort!] made to Her? Should not we, as good educators, also be capable of overlooking various faults and making every effort to open up broader vistas? And should we not admit that some unpleasant things have also emerged in Church circles? At times one gets the impression that our society needs to have at least one group to which no tolerance may be shown; which one can easily attack and hate. And should someone dare to approach them – in this case the Pope [the hellish nerve of this persecutor and isolator of tradition!]– he too loses any right to tolerance; He too can be treated hatefully, without misgiving or restraint.

Dear Brothers, during the days when I first had the idea of writing this letter, by chance, during a visit to the Roman Seminary, I had to interpret and comment on Galatians 5:13-15. I was surprised at the directness with which that passage speaks to us about the present moment: “Do not use your freedom as an opportunity for the flesh, but through love be servants of one another. For the whole law is fulfilled in one word: ‘You shall love your neighbour as yourself’. But if you bite and devour one another, take heed that you are not consumed by one another.” I am always tempted to see these words as another of the rhetorical excesses which we occasionally find in Saint Paul.

[Benny surely went out of his way to find his quotation. Having found it, he weasels his way out of having chosen it by calling it a rhetorical excess. Could he not have made his point by fuller quotation as in St. Mark’s Gospel? 12:29-31. “And Jesus answered him: The first commandment of all is, Hear, O Israel: the Lord thy God is one God. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and with thy whole soul and with thy whole mind and with thy whole strength. This is the first commandment. And the second is like to it: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.” Not the whole law, then but a poor second, resembling the essential. But Benny’s selection (accidentally?) pushes Vatican II’s emphasis on man.]

But sad to say, this “biting and devouring” also exists in the Church today, as expression of a poorly understood freedom. Should we be surprised that we too are no better than the Galatians? That at the very least we are threatened by the same temptations? That we must always learn anew the proper use of freedom? And that we must always learn anew the supreme priority, which is Love? The day I spoke about this at the Major Seminary, the feast of Our Lady of Trust was being celebrated in Rome. And so it is: Mary teaches us trust. She leads us to her Son, in whom all of us can put our trust. He will be our guide – even in turbulent times. And so I would like to offer heartfelt thanks to all the many Bishops who have lately offered Me touching tokens of trust and affection, and above all assured me of their prayers. My thanks also go to all the Faithful who in these days have given Me testimony of their constant fidelity to the Successor of Saint Peter. May the Lord protect all of us and guide our steps along the way of peace. This is the prayer that rises up instinctively from My heart at the beginning of this Lent, a liturgical season particularly suited to interior purification, one which invites all of us to look with renewed hope to the light which awaits us at Easter.

With a special Apostolic Blessing, I remain
Yours in the Lord,
BENEDICTUS PP. XVI,
Vatican, 10 March 2009

[What a wonderful example of the theology(?) of the great Renewal! But let us pursue Ratzinger back into his tenure as Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.]

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH

Commencing his speech in his address (January 29, 1993) at the Waldensian “Evangelical Center”, Cardinal Ratzinger spoke of ecumenism saying that its “ultimate aim is, obviously, the unity of the churches in the one Church,” underscoring that (it is) “the unity of the Church of God to which we tend.”

But we ask ourselves: if the “Church is one” (and is that not the “Catholic Church”?), why are the “other churches” there? Or perhaps the Cardinal is saying that even the “Catholic Church” is **one** of the “churches” that are to unite in the future to form the “one true Church.” But if the “Catholic Church” is already the “one true Church,” wouldn’t the “aim” have been already achieved? But if the Church is not “one” already, then ecumenism, such as was willed by the Vatican II, should have as its aim the abjuration on the part of the “heretics” and “schismatics” of their “errors.” And that goes without a doubt, for the other “churches” are but “sects,” conventicles destined not to unite themselves, but to fade away!

But if these “churches” of which Ratzinger speaks, are instead to “unite” into the “one true Church,” then the “Prefect of the Congregation for the Faith” wants to bring us to accept that error which Pius XI had already condemned in his Encyclical “Mortalium Animos”, which reads in fact: “And here it will be opportune to identify and to remove the error, which lies at the root of this question and of the various initiatives by which non-Catholics seek to bring about the union of the Christian churches. Those who favor this view quote these words of Christ time and again: ‘That they all may be one... And there shall be one fold and one shepherd,’ (Jo. XVII, 21; X, 16) as if Jesus thereby expressed a desire and a prayer that has not yet been granted. For they think that the unity of faith and government - distinctive marks of the Church - has hardly up to the present time existed, and does not exist today; it may indeed be desired and it may even be attained through a little common will, but for the moment, as things are, it is just an idea. They add that the Church is of its nature divided into sections, made up of several churches or distinct communities, which, divergent as they are, hold in common but some articles of doctrine, while they differ for the rest and each maintains its own rights.”

How, then, can the Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation for the Faith, defend himself? For he, against Pius XI, has indeed expressed himself thus: “This therefore the goal, the aim of every ecumenical effort: to attain the real unity of the Church, which implies a multitude of forms which we cannot as yet define.”

But then, Your Eminence, the unity, according to you, now does not exist? Is it only apparent? You, in fact, state elsewhere: “I wouldn’t dare, for the time being, suggest for the future any concrete, possible, and conceivable realizations.”

It was obvious, therefore, that the Waldensian Professor Ricca held in high appreciation the words of Cardinal Ratzinger, as they coincided with his own thinking. In fact, after recalling the eight centuries of strife between Catholics and Waldensians, Ricca said, “... why are we together? We are here together because, if it is true that we know well who we are, and know well enough who we have been, we don’t know, however, who we will be. It is the same reservation on the part of the Cardinal in not proposing models, in not knowing; it is the very attitude that, all told, binds us together.”

Hence we Catholics, as the Waldensians, do not know yet what the Church will be like! But is this not one more erroneous distortion on the part of Cardinal Ratzinger, who here appears unable to reconcile his statements with the indefectibility of the Church? But what model of a Church can he propose to the Protestants other than the one that Christ himself desired, founding his Church upon Peter? How can a “cardinal” not know what the Church ought to be like, two thousand years after Christ founded her? Cardinal Ratzinger thinks, perhaps, like the heretic Teilhard de Chardin, that the Church is still evolving toward its Omega point, final goal of this ecumenism of Vatican II?

Let us not imagine that unity may be attained without evolution. We shall pass through “unity in diversity.” Ratzinger explains: “This model could, I think, be expressed by the well-known formula of the ‘reconciled diversity,’ approved by Professor Ricca: “This base can serve as a starting point: the very concept of ‘reconciled diversity’ is of Lutheran origin.”

Cardinal Ratzinger would like the Church of Rome to turn into a pluriform church, based on a Lutheran pattern! And that would be accomplished – always according to the Cardinal! – “by walking together, in a humility respectful of each other, even where the compatibility in doctrine or practice of the church has yet to be attained; it consists in the willingness to learn from each other and to accept each other’s corrections, in joy and gratitude for each one’s spiritual treasures, in a permanent essentialization of one’s own faith, doctrine and practice, which must be continually purified and nourished by Scripture, while keeping our eyes fixed on the Lord.”

1st: How can we “walk together” while acting differently?

2nd. If the “Church of Christ” is the Church of Rome, and the “Seat of Truth,” how can she even be “corrected” by the heretics? How can the Church “respect” the Lutheran heresy and schism? What distinguished the Protestant “churches” or “sects” from the Church of Rome?

3d: what does “in a permanent essentialization of one’s own faith” mean?

This idea of Ratzinger’s is proper to all German theology: “The search for ... the essence of Christianity, has been typical of German theology for more than a century! Recall the works of L. Feurbach (1841), of A. Harnack (1900), of K. Adam (1924), of R. Guardini (1939), of M. Schmaus (1947), and Karl Rahner’s proposal of a synthetic formulation of the Christian message. ... Ratzinger’s research on the essence of Christianity clearly bears the mark of its time, ... ‘the post-Christian age of faith,’ characterized not so much by negations of this or that truth of the Faith, but rather by the fact that Faith, as a whole, seems to have lost its drive, its capacity to interpret the world, as opposed to other views which seem, if nothing else, endowed with a higher operational capacity.” (23)

This approach, if put into practice, would destroy Faith itself. Pius XI in “*Mortalium Animos*”: “The supernatural virtue of Faith has as its formal cause the authority of God revealing; and this cause does not allow ... distinction. All true Christians, with the same faith as they believe the dogma of the Holiest Trinity, believe the dogma of the Immaculate Conception; and the Incarnation of our Lord, as they do the Infallible Magisterium of the Roman Pontiff, in the sense ... defined by the Vatican Council. [Because] these truths have been solemnly sanctioned and defined by the Church at different times, ... are they perhaps not equally certain, or not equally to be believed? Has not God revealed them all?”

Ratzinger does not explain the essence of Faith, or what its “superstructures” could be. In his conclusive reply, however, the “Prefect of the Congregation for the Faith” indicates that his thought “coincides with that of Professor Ricca” with regard to the word “essentialization.” (24).

That is grave! At a time in which the problem is precisely the absence of God, ought it not to be our primary concern to bear witness to the living God?

Instead, in full agreement with Professor Ricca, Cardinal Ratzinger speaks of “essentialization” of Faith, of that “essentialization” which the other modernist, the Dominican Father Congar called “ressourcement.” And the Cardinal, in addition, observes that this process, which he deems “positive,” comes from the other “churches,” hence the Catholic Church would be continually purified... by the “heretic sects!”

According to Ratzinger, “The Church of Rome would have the duty to let herself be purified and enriched by the other churches (...), to acknowledge the sister churches and to love the communities of the other churches, for the Lord uses the different communities for each other’s good, to make us capable and worthy of the ultimate unity” (25).

So God would be consenting to “heresies”, whereas, prior to the Vatican II, it was taught that God permits them, as he permits any other evil! And again – always according to Cardinal Ratzinger! – God would consent, on a temporary basis, to the different communities (“divisions”) as they would perfect each other! And the Catholic Church, in this manner, would be “purified,” and would strive equally with the other “churches-sects” toward a revolutionary “unity” of a “New Church” which would evolve!

We should conclude that Cardinal Ratzinger is endeavoring to put us on the path that leads toward this unknown, future Church, hence abandoning the pre-Vatican II Church, which we have always believed to be the eternal and immutable Church of Christ!

Not so! Even the “Church of the origin” – always according to Cardinal Ratzinger – was merely a “model,” united “in the three fundamental elements: Sacred Scripture, *Rule of Faith*, and Sacramental Structure of the Church.” (26)

Was the Church of the origin not united, perhaps, under the Magisterium and the Government of the Pope? Was there not, perhaps, the same Faith present in all of the Christian communities? How, then, could Ratzinger one day dare to declare Pius XI’s “*Mortalium Animos*” consistent with Vatican II? Pius XI himself says therein, very clearly, that ecumenist, or pan-Christian theory “paves the way to naturalism and atheism” and prepares “a self-styled Christian religion far removed from the one Church of Christ,” and which “is the path to the neglect of religion or indifferentism, and to modernism,” and which “is a foolishness and an absurdity!”

[From THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH to this point originated from Msgr. Luigi Villa’s pamphlet on Ratzinger (heavily cut). We lack space for the footnotes, which may be checked in the original and its translation.]

Elizabeth Gerstner, foundress of *Una Voce*, warned us never to talk to Ratzinger because he could talk anyone into anything. We are indeed fortunate that he writes; he is far less persuasive on paper, where we have time for analysis.

Don Luigi has demonstrated that “Cardinal” Ratzinger has publicly embraced heresies while filling an office originally intended to preserve and defend the Faith. We must conclude that he was ineligible for the papacy, and that he has now usurped the supreme office whereby he can advance his ecumenical agenda without opposition. He can, therefore, excommunicate for failure to accept as gospel some of the logistically absurd aberrations contrived by doctrinaire “historians.” (A bad joke? Read the next one!)

If that fails, for failure to accept the Second Vatican Council and all its heresies, we can be subjected to that unbiased final authority on Catholic doctrine and practice, the Southern Poverty Law Center.

Given the fact that all our canon laws are written in Latin and all our dogmas are defined in Latin, why has the study of the Latin language been made optional in nearly all Latin rite seminaries? How can a priest function in ignorance of the Church’s official language?

The War Is Now! No. 77 September 2009

We have recently acquired an English version of Mgr Luigi Villa’s classic, *Paolo Sesto Beato?*, written in response to the barefaced attempt to beatify, then canonize, by all odds the worst antipope in history. From this fantastically researched compilation we present highly pertinent matter on the introduction of the *novus ordo missae*:

Pius V’s Bull, *Quo Primum*, still stands with all its weight and authority.

Namely: could Paul VI change the texts of the Mass? He certainly could, as a Pope, had disciplinary questions been at issue, but, because of its dogmatic nature, the faithful fulfillment of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, in keeping with the Will of Jesus Christ and in line with the traditional teaching of many centuries, given us by the Church, Paul VI could not do it, having no right to change as much as a hair of the *Depositum Fidei*:

Hence Paul VI was free to change some “prayers”, but he could not introduce anything into the Mass that might alter the Catholic doctrine, and, therefore, the traditional Catholic Faith.

Pope Innocent III (1198-1215) had ruled:

“The consecratory formula of the ‘Roman Canon’ has been imposed on the Apostles by Christ directly, and handed down by the Apostles to their successors.”

And the Florentine Council (1442), in its Decree for the Greeks and the Armenians, had solemnly reiterated and confirmed the same dogmatic doctrine of Tradition, as witnessed by Innocent III. Thus the historical fact, incontrovertible, clearly demonstrates that:

The celebration of the Holy Eucharistic Sacrifice of the Mass, and, therefore, even the formulation of the consecration, preceded by at least two decades the appearance of all of the Scriptural texts of the New Testament.

It is consequently censurable that, after the Church had been using for nearly two millennia, continuously (without a single dispute), the formula of the pre-conciliar Roman Canon, it should be necessary to revise and modify it, particularly the formula of the Eucharistic Consecration, willed by Christ... ever since the onset of the Apostolic preaching of the Gospel.

Paul VI, having abolished the Eucharistic consecratory formula of the Roman Canon (which, as Innocent III and the Florentine Council had taught, was instituted by Christ and had always been used by the Roman Catholic Church), replaced it with his own formula (which, therefore, is no longer that instituted by Christ), even making it mandatory, as of November 30, 1969, having introduced it in the *Missale Romanum* Apostolic Constitution of April 3, 1969.

And yet, St. Pius V, St. Pius X, Pius XII (Pope of the “*Mediator Dei*”), John XXIII and Paul VI himself, up until November 30, 1969, had consecrated the Blessed Eucharist with the bi-millennial formula of the Roman Canon, with assurance, with compassion, with faith, in the Latin language, with subdued voice, following Canon IX of Session XXIII of the Council of Trent.

Paul VI, with His reform of the Mass, disregarded the teaching of the (1870) Vatican Council, which reads, verbatim:

“The Holy Ghost has promised the successors of Peter, not that they may disclose new doctrine by His revelation, but that they may, with His assistance, preserve conscientiously and expound faithfully the revelation transmitted through the Apostles, the deposit of Faith.” (*Pastor Aeternus*, July 18, 1870)

In addition: Paul VI, having disregarded the two aforementioned documents of the Supreme Magisterium, went so far as to tamper with the Eucharistic Consecratory Formula, established by Christ in person, insinuating, almost, to the entire Church, that that formula contained something that needed fixing, violating, in this manner, also Canon 6 of the Council of Trent, which sanctioned:

“*SI QUIS DIXERIT CANONEM MISSAE CONTINERE ERRORES, IDEOQUE ABROGANDUM ESSE, ANATHEMA SIT.*” (If anyone will have said that the Canon of the Mass contains errors, and must therefore be abrogated, let him be anathema.)

Now, having intentionally abolished that Canon’s consecratory formula, replacing it with another, specious and polyvalent, in order to please the Protestants, should Paul VI be comprised, too, under that excommunication of the Council of Trent?

All St. Pius V did was to extend to the entire West the traditional Roman Mass, as a barrier against Protestantism. Paul VI abolished the Traditional Roman Rite since His “pastoral” aims were not for Catholics but for Protestants. His *Novus Ordo* was but a “remarkable departure from the Catholic theology of the Holy Mass” (Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci in their “Brief Critical Review.” Even *Osservatore Romano* (13 October 1967) announced: “The liturgical reform has taken a remarkable step forward (sic) and has come closer to the liturgical forms of the Lutheran Church.”

A liturgical turn that has all the flavor of a betrayal of the Faith! St. Pius V retained the traditional Roman Rite “as surely Catholic.” Paul VI abolished the Traditional Roman Rite precisely because it was Catholic, in order to introduce his new Missal, positively protestantized, as one can easily prove.

We conclude that the *Novus Ordo Missae* is not a vertical cult, going from man to God, but a horizontal cult, between man and man. The New Church of Paul VI is, as already demonstrated, the religion of man, to the detriment of God’s glory. Please note that:

(1) in the *libera nos* of the *Novus Ordo Missae* no mention is made of the Blessed Virgin Mary or of the Saints. Their intercession, therefore, is no longer invoked, not even at times of peril.

(2) in none of the three new Eucharistic Prayers ... is there the tiniest hint of the suffering of the departed, and in none is there the possibility of a special *memento*; which depletes faith in the propitiatory and redemptive nature of the Sacrifice.

(3) Paul VI’s *Novus Ordo Missae* is not faithful even to Vatican II’s directives, but rather openly contradicts them, since the texts and rites, according to the Council, had to be arranged “in such a way that would allow the holy realities signified by them to be expressed more clearly.”

On the contrary, the *Novus Ordo Missae* represents a collection of changes, of deformations, of departures, of simplistic expedients, naïve and harmful or altogether senseless. It ceases to utter – or misreads – numerous truths of the Catholic Faith.

It will suffice to list the principal titles of points of departure and non-observance of the principles set out by Vatican II itself:

- a new definition of the Mass;
- a suppression of the Latreutic element;
- a paucity of “orations of offering”;
- suppression of the Trinitarian formulas;
- elimination of important orations, both of the celebrant and of the faithful;
- abbreviations of Angels and Saints;
- grave dogmatic shortfall of the new “Eucharistic prayers”;
- the weakened position of the celebrant;
- the change of the religious ornaments and of the religious countenance of the faithful;
- the free spaces for the autonomous “creativity” of the celebrant; – etc...

It is impossible, therefore, to adduce as evidence that the form impressed upon the “*Ordo Missae*” had been based upon the indications of Vatican II. And the fact that the Bishops, after attending that “normative

Mass” which Paul VI had had presented to them, rejected it, stands as a further alarm signal.

That “new Mass” is thus entirely Paul VI’s doing. Behind the “*Novus Ordo*” stands only Paul VI with His “authority.”

It must be said that the Traditional Mass of St. Pius V was never legally abrogated, and remains, to this day [and forever], a true rite of the Catholic Church, through which the faithful can fulfill their holy day precept - because St. Pius V had granted a perpetual indult (never abrogated), valid “for all time” to celebrate the Traditional Mass, freely, legally, without any scruples and without incurring any penalty, conviction, or censure.

Paul VI himself, in promulgating his *Novus Ordo Missae*, never had any intention of involving Papal infallibility, as He himself stated in His address of 19 November 1969:

“...ritual and rubrics are not *per se* matter for dogmatic definition; they are susceptible to a theological qualification of a different value..”

Paul VI himself, to the explicit question of the English Cardinal Heenan, whether he had prohibited the Tridentine Mass, had replied:

“It is not my intention to prohibit the Tridentine Mass in any way.”

Since the (1870) Vatican Council (dogmatic) established that:

“The Holy Ghost has promised the successors of Peter, not that they may disclose new doctrine by His revelation, but that they may, with His assistance, preserve conscientiously and expound faithfully the revelation transmitted through the Apostles, the deposit of Faith.” (*Pastor Aeternus*, July 18, 1870) it must be concluded that Paul VI’s *Novus Ordo Missae*, having introduced into his New Church a new doctrine – as previously demonstrated – cannot be matter of obedience (obedience in the service of Faith and not Faith in the service of obedience), hence any faithful is left with a theological duty of obedience to God prior than to man, if he intends to remain inflexible in his profession of the Catholic Faith, according to the infallible doctrine of Tradition. □ (So far Luigi Villa)

Retirement

Innovation is the hallmark of the postconciliar “Church,” and one of its mightiest weapons. Nothing new is Catholic. It is hard to imagine a beneficial ecclesiastical innovation.

But clerical retirement, one of the worst, is seldom considered. It spawns a host of evils probably worse than itself. Firstly, retirement is mentioned only twice in the 1917 Code of Canon Laws, both times referring to the lack of effect on appointments or jurisdiction conferred by a superior who has since retired. Of the relevant canons, we present:

Canon 475. If the pastor, through old age, mental debility, incompetence, blindness, or other permanent inability, is incapable of discharging his duties properly, the Ordinary shall give him an assistant vicar. If the parish is in charge of a religious community, the religious superior presents the vicar. . . .

If the pastor is of sound mind, the vicar must help him in the pastoral duties under his authority and according to the bishop’s instructions. If the spiritual interests of the parish cannot be properly taken care of by an assistant acting as vicar, the bishop has the right to remove the pastor according to the formalities described in Canons 2147-2161.

Canon 2147. An irremovable pastor may be removed from his parish for a reason which makes his ministry in the parish harmful or at least inefficacious, even though there be no grave guilt on the part of the pastor. These reasons are especially the following:

- (1) incompetency or permanent mental or bodily infirmity which incapacitate the pastor from discharging properly the duties of his office, if the Ordinary judge that the welfare of souls cannot be provided for by the appointment of an assistant priest (the *vicarius adjutor* spoken of in Canon 475);
- (2) the hatred of the people, though unjust and not universal, provided it is such as to hinder the useful ministry of the pastor, and is not expected to abate soon;
- (3) loss of good reputation among virtuous and serious men, whether this is caused by the levity of conduct of the pastor, or by a former offense which has recently been detected and for which he cannot now be punished on account of prescription barring prosecution, or by the conduct of members of his household or blood-relations living with him, unless by their departure the good reputation of the pastor can be restored;

(4) a probable occult crime imputed to the pastor which is of such a nature that the Ordinary prudently foresees that great scandal may be thereby provoked among the faithful;

(5) inefficient administration of the temporal goods with great damage to the church or benefice, whenever the evil cannot be remedied either by depriving the pastor of the administration or in some other manner, though otherwise the pastor usefully exercises the spiritual ministry.

These are the chief reasons for removal, although other reasons are not excluded. The Code has but one principle in this matter, namely, the good of the parish; and, if the parish suffers seriously either in its spiritual or its temporal wellbeing and the harm cannot be averted except by removal of the pastor, he must be sacrificed for the sake of the common weal. The reasons stated by the Code as the chief causes for removal are vague, for the Code leaves it to the conscience and the discretion of the bishop to decide whether the removal is truly necessary to avert serious spiritual or temporal harm from the parish. The removal is not a matter of punishment, for, if it were, the vagueness of the reasons for removal would be inexcusable; it is simply a case in which private rights which conflict with the common welfare must be sacrificed.

The Council of Trent has the following law: "Inasmuch as illiterate and unskilled rectors of parish churches are but little fit for the sacred offices; and others, by reason of the turpitude of their lives, rather destroy than edify; the bishops, even as the delegates of the Apostolic See, may depute to the said illiterate and unskilled rectors, if they be otherwise of a blameless life, coadjutors or vicars for the time being, and assign to the same a part of the fruits for their sufficient maintenance, or provide for them in some other manner, setting aside any appeal or exception whatsoever. But, as for those who live shameful and scandalous lives, they shall, after having first admonished, restrain and punish them; and, if they shall still continue incorrigible in their wickedness, they shall have power to deprive them of their benefices, according to the constitutions of the sacred canons, setting aside every exemption or appeal whatsoever."

Canon 2154. After a pastor has been removed, the Ordinary shall consult the examiners or the parochial consultors who took part in the proceedings of removal, and carefully decide what provision should be made for the pastor. According to the facts and circumstances of the case, he may be either transferred to another parish, or assigned some other office or benefice (if he is capable of filling it), or pensioned. All other things being equal, a pastor who resigns is to receive more favorable consideration in this provision than a pastor who was removed.

Canon 2155. The question of providing for the removed pastor may be settled by the Ordinary either in the decree of removal or afterwards, but it should be done as soon as possible.

Canon 2161. After the lapse of the specified term, which may be prolonged by the Ordinary at his discretion, he shall issue the decree of removal. The Ordinary is obliged to provide for the resigning or removed pastor according to Canons 2154-2156.

Canon 2182. If a pastor grossly neglects or violates the pastoral duties described in Canon 467 (administering the Sacraments, guiding and instructing his people in their spiritual duties), Canon 468 (assisting the sick and the dying), Canon 1178 (guarding the church against profanation, keeping it clean), Canons 1330-1332 and 1344 (preaching and teaching of Christian doctrine), the bishop shall admonish him, reminding him of his strict obligation of conscience and the penalties which the law decrees against these offenses.

Canon 2183. If the pastor does not amend, and the bishop, after having consulted two of the examiners and given the pastor an opportunity to defend himself, has found proof that the above- mentioned parochial duties have repeatedly been neglected or violated in serious matters for a notable length of time without any just excuse, he shall rebuke the pastor, and impose on him an appropriate penalty in proportion to his guilt.

Canon 2184. If both the rebuke and the punishment prove unavailing, the Ordinary, after having proved according to Canon 2183 the pastor's culpable perseverance in the neglect or violation of the pastoral duties in a grave matter, may at once deprive a removable pastor of his parish; he may deprive an irremovable pastor of the income of his benefice, either in whole or in part in proportion to the gravity of his guilt, and distribute it among the poor.

The farcical 1983 code in canon 142 §1 ("Delegated power lapses ... on the retirement of the person delegated.") in its sole reference treats retirement from a directly opposite view.

Formerly a parish priest or a bishop held his job for life. If he outlived his competence the Church sent in Bing Crosby. He may have had worries, but none of them were financial.

The postconsillier “Church” has withdrawn his security and forces him to submit his resignation when he reaches a certain age, despite (or because of?) his accumulated experience and wisdom which should be at the service of the Church, especially the great lay majority, all at a time of disastrous dearth of replacements.

This tends to make him acquisitive. He must provide for himself in his imposed retirement. And he is supposed to believe that he loses his authority and jurisdiction through this innovation foisted upon him by the utterly incompetent, heretical newchurch usurpers in the Vatican and in that other monstrous innovation, his Bishops’ Conference.

* * * * *

A letter has come from Australia to cancel a subscription to **The War Is Now!** because the subscriber can no longer trust me because I grant annulments. Some one’s gotta do it! But some one else.

I have been screaming for years that laymen have no authority in religious matters. So now one who has been on my list for years takes the word of scandalmongers who cash in on fairy tales, to the extent that they thrive on being sued. One could be expected to consider the source.

But then if something is presented in print it assumes greater credibility. That is one of my excuses for writing. And if I am accused of losing the plot, at least the accuser agrees that there is a plot. I may have to settle for that. But we enjoy our notoriety because most of our hierarchy and clergy had succumbed to the plotters.

* * * * *

Among the plotters was that sterling phony traditionalist “archbishop” Marcel Lefebvre, who arrogated to himself the leadership of the loyal opposition when Newrome had discovered that we could constitute a threat. Never once in all the years of his phony war did he admit the obvious invalidity of the *novus ordo missae* or its papal sponsors. Nor did he ever release that “earth-shaking weapon” he held against Montini. Instead he provided sincere young men an inadequate education and invalid ordinations. He would expel them for declining to use the traditional Missal instead of Roncalli’s 1962 innovation. He would on occasion send a man with a newchurch “ordination”—without warning—to service people who accept his ordinary \$\$\$ impersonator. He even celebrated the *novus ordo missae* in St. Peter’s on the altar under which lie the incorrupt remains of St. Pius X. I grow tired reading about Fellay betraying the heroic founder. Fellay carries out the dance Lefebvre taught him, toward Lefebvre’s own goal. And Williamson is there to impede the escape of those followers who will not dance.

* * * * *

Do we want to win?

The Catholic Church has always been recognized by its four marks, the first of which is unity. So in the subverted, infiltrated semblance of an organized edifice filling the Roman vacuum, where can it be found? What doctrine or practice of the postconciliar “Church” can be shown identical with anything universally held by nineteen centuries of Catholics? Unity escapes even those of us who promote return of control to Catholics. It seems elementary to some that we must return to the entire system that worked for nineteen centuries. Others insist that we must adhere to the pope; therefore we have a pope. A major difficulty is that the claimant to the papacy so seldom agrees with nineteen centuries of his predecessors.

The more recent usurpers don’t agree with each other, or even with themselves on different days, though each of the last four has dedicated his “pontificate” to further implementation of the decrees and documents of the Second Vatican Council. None of these would require implementation were they not innovation. Let us repeat that innovation is error—that nothing new is Catholic—that genuine popes swore to pass on unchanged to their successors what they had received from their predecessors.

There is a defense mechanism which confines itself to one or two heresies and insists that they can be construed as orthodox. But one may read most of the output of the Second Vatican Council and never find a single sentence which conveys a clearly recognizable idea. This is in itself something new. Catholic Church laws and doctrines have always been published in easily understood language. Equivocation and ambiguity have replaced definition.

We can waste years on individual heresies and abuses. We must penetrate the innovative intention. Each of us should ask: “How would I go about destroying the Church?” See if we can improve on what has been imposed on us by our(?) clergy, hierarchy, and “popes!”

They have done a wonderfully efficient job of assaulting our faith and morals from every possible aspect. They have robbed us of the ordinary means of salvation, and our children from realizing this by “Catholic education.” They have welshed on support of the family and its values. If they espouse a public issue they

almost unanimously embrace the wrong side. We are driven to the conclusions that they have left us and that they have done so deliberately.

Since the Catholic Church, preserved by the Holy Ghost from erroneous doctrine or religious practice, cannot have wandered by mistake into this present incredible condition, we must conclude that “an enemy hath done this” by means of widespread collusion in a superbly organized plot. Though this conclusion places us among the mindless, if we fail to recognize this we shall have little success against the plotters. We should be in the courts charging and proving heresy and suing for return of church property.

Not that the courts can or will rule on such matters. But we would make the news, and cost the heretics money for defense. Of course the ex-Catholic “Church” does not mind destroying the organization financially as well. It continues to sell off parishes, convents, monasteries, and schools in its efforts to pay fines, costs, and awards for pederasty. But all can help in the war to recovery of the real Catholic Church by refusing to contribute to its illegitimate replacement.

* * * * *

Jerusalem — Pilgrim Benedict XVI celebrated an open-air mess, prayed at the Wailing Wall, and visited the Dome of the Rock, whence Mohamet ascended to heaven. These events (May 12) emphasized that Jerusalem, contact for Christianity, Judaism, and Islam, must revert to a city of peace. He told Islamic leaders gathered at the Dome that Christians, Muslims, and Jews share a “grave responsibility” to expand dialogue and mend divisions.

Then to the Wailing Wall, sacred to the Jews, and inserted a written prayer into a crevice. It asked God to “hear the cry of the afflicted, the fearful, the bereft; send your peace upon this Holy Land, upon the Middle East, upon the entire human family.” He stood in silent prayer before the wall for two minutes, much as his predecessor, John Paul II, had done nine years earlier.

In the evening the Pilgrim celebrated mess in the Josafat Valley beneath Mt. Olivet. He called for the city to regain its vocation “as prophecy and promise of that universal reconciliation and peace which God desires for the whole human family.”

Sadly, in today’s Jerusalem, he said, “hope continues to battle despair, frustration and cynicism, while the peace which is God’s gift and call continues to be threatened by selfishness, conflict, division and the burden of past wrongs.”

Welcoming the Pilgrim, Latin Patriarch Fouad Twal said Palestinians dream of a free and independent state of their own, while people of Israel dream of living in peace and security; the Catholic community is shrinking, mainly because of emigration due to the “unjust occupation” of Palestinian land by Israel and “all its humiliation.”

May 11 started with remembrance of Jewish suffering under the Nazi extermination, and a strong caution of new forms of anti-Semitism. Arriving at the international Airport in Tel Aviv, the Pilgrim said he had come to honor the memory of the six million victims of the Holocaust and “to pray that humanity will never again witness a crime of such magnitude. Sadly, anti-Semitism rears its ugly head in many parts of the world. This is totally unacceptable.”

In a visit to the Yad Vashem Holocaust memorial Benedict prayed silently before the eternal flame in the Hall of Remembrance and said the suffering of Jews under the Nazi extermination campaign must “never be denied, belittled or forgotten.”

The “pope” called the Holocaust an atrocity that disgraced mankind and said the Church is committed to working tirelessly “to ensure that hatred will never reign in the hearts of men again.”

He met with six Holocaust survivors, who later expressed appreciation for the gesture. But some leaders were disappointed that the “pope” never mentioned the Nazi perpetrators.

That evening he told a group of interreligious dialogue experts that religions must give common witness to God’s rightful place in the world. A muslim sheik denounced Israeli policies, and some Jewish representatives walked out.

Benedict-Papa Ratzinger announced May 12, 2009, that Newchurch “will henceforth desist from all missionary and conversion activities” among the Jews. This barefaced discrimination against Jews—entitled, as all others, to Christ’s gospel of salvation—confirms Ratzinger’s prior statement as head of Newchurch’s Doctrine of the Faith, that the Jews can look for their own Messias. At the meeting with rabbis, staged next to Jerusalem’s Great Synagogue, Chief Ashkenazi Rabbi Yona Metzger thanked Benedict-Ratzinger, calling his announcement an “historic agreement and for us, an immensely important message,” and for preventing

the reinstatement of “holocaust-denying” SSPX Bishop(?) Richard Williamson. “I commend with appreciation your clear proclamation that anti-Semitism is not only a sin against the Jews, but also a sin against God.”

Rabbi Metzger concluded with an astonishing proposal for a body of World Religion, “an international body, a U.N. for religions alongside the U.N. for diplomats and statesmen. There, side by side, around one [round?] table will sit the representatives of all the religions.” [Astonishing? Has this not always been a major goal of the one-world conspiracy that has usurped our religion?]

The Pilgrim landed first in Jordan. At Amman’s airport May 8 he professed “deep respect” for the Muslim community. In Amman he visited the Regina Pacis center, a facility for the disabled; it underscored the charitable role of Jordan’s Christians in co-operation with Muslims.

May 9 he visited the King Hussein Mosque and paused briefly in “respectful meditation,” said the Vatican. He warned Muslim academics and religious leaders against the “ideological manipulation of religion” (his own forte) which can act as catalyst for tensions and violence. He then used his popemobile from Mt. Nebo, where Moses glimpsed the Promised Land to the biblical city, Madaba, where he blessed the foundation of the first Catholic university in Jordan.

His mess May 8 in an Amman soccer stadium was the liturgical peak of his visit. He preached as a simple pastor, recognizing the struggle of Christian families in the land where Christ was born.

Later the Pilgrim visited the Jordan River where archaeologists place the site of Jesus’ baptism by St. John the Baptist. He blessed the foundation stones of two churches — one Latin-rite, the other Melkite — to be built there, and declared the projects a hopeful sign for a Christian community that goes back to the Church’s beginnings.

* * * * *

Weakland Criminal Rehash – Insufficient Damage?

I like the way some articles try to exculpate Weakland because his sodomite partner of record was not a child at the time. And look at all the good he did in bringing the “Church” into the modern world. The overlong career of Milwaukee Archbishop Rembert G. Weakland, one of the church’s outstanding innovators, terminated in May, 2002. He had been so lonely as a bishop. He apparently could not fight his subsequent silence without committing his classic prose to paper. It says much for the publishing community that he could find an outlet.

He milks sympathy for an imaginary four hundred million perverts who are doomed by a merciless god to sexual frustration, and corrects Catholic theology in their (and his own) interest. That homosexuality is “objectively disordered” are bad words because *pejorative*. How can bad deeds by bad dudes be that bad?

He had thought of the embarrassment of the Benedictines and the archdiocese, but his heart was in the right place so he overcame at least the temptation to publish posthumously, that he might live to enjoy the resultant embarrassment with them. *Cui bono?*

Weakland, in a videotaped deposition released last November, admitted returning sexually abusive priests to active ministry without warning parishioners or police. Christians, he said, should more openly discuss queers in the priesthood without the “hysteria” that often characterizes the debate.

He is reported also to have worked on a liturgy commission for the Second Vatican Council. But that major crime seems not to have aroused his blush mechanism.

* * * * *

Reaction to twin! #76

Email reply: do u know why jews do not believe jesus was the messiah? And do you know why jews are the chosen people? why was einstein a genius? why does G-d grant such wisdom to Jews?

We assume, reluctantly, that the above lines were meant seriously. This utterly irrelevant approach exemplifies an attitude which tends to inhibit conversion of the proud. Their very brilliance works against them.

“If you’re so smart, why ain’t you rich?”
“Without us you would never have invented the bomb!”
“We’re brighter; we must be righter.”

The hole in this correction is enormous. In its infinite depths can be discerned the brightest loser of all the ages, Lucifer.

Jews are that portion of the chosen which rejected their Messiah. Why? We are not experts on irrational behavior.

Why chosen? We are not experts on divine behavior. We must assume that the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, knowing all things, knew when He came that a portion of the chosen would reject and conspire to kill Him.

Was Einstein a genius? The only genius?

Why does God grant such wisdom to Jews? Why did God create Lucifer? Not knowing that he would revolt?

* * * * *

I believe that I could make a case that **Protestants—and postconciliar Catholics—worship another God.** I appeal to the postconciliar “popes.” What greater authority can be cited? Did Garrulous Karolus the Koran-Kisser, in his official capacity, not tell the Moslems that he and his (postconci) liar “church” worship the same god that the Moslems worship? Did Benny the Rat-zinger not remove his shoes to enter a mosque or two at prayer time?

Have none of the final foolish five frequented synagogues at worship time, and declared the denizens our elder brothers in the faith—in *Whom?* Surely not in our Blessed Trinity.

Have all five not saddled us with Ecumenism, whereby we refuse the mandate of Jesus Christ to make disciples of all men? Those who dialogue with Protestants on equal footing essentially deny His right to command us. They disbelieve His plainest words. Deliberately or not, **they lack faith!** Like those with whom they dialogue, they believe in a god in their own image, who will pat them on the head because they seek common compromise rather than His truth.

If we want God on our side, it behoves us to line up on His side — and to remember that He was here first. He took no advice on creation; He would have had to create the advisers. Nor is He a democrat. If men can vote, why not angels? Anyway, it’s no great task to rig a voting machine.

Which brings up Lucifer. He had it all, but he must have thought he could control what he could not create, by virtue of numbers. If a farmer wants a bumper crop, will he rely on fertilizer or public opinion? (Same god?)

* * * * *

Homeland Security Targets

Homeland Security, like every other useless tax-supported organization, tries hard to justify its existence, and its totalitarian-democratic methods. It has, in a nine-page **Assessment**, specified major targets, against which it vigilantly protects us. Appropriately, its list of terrorists first targets gun owners and buyers of firearms and ammunition.

Next we find those who believe that the federal government has expanded out of reason, and has invaded the territory and jurisdiction of the states—from which its powers are delegated and derived—or of local authorities.

Then follow those who oppose murder of the unborn.

Next we find those who oppose our massive illegal immigration, which Homeland Security largely ignores. In rapid, blanket-style classification we find veterans of our armed forces, all of whom were told that they defended their country while invading other countries, those against the new administration which promised to call the troops home, those who oppose social programs for minorities, those who favor the constitutional right to bear arms, and those who believe in end-time prophecies.

Finally come Christians and militias. Don’t our misrulers realize that only the majority Christian conscience keeps them alive?

As I scan this list of terrorists it dawns on me that I have achieved a personal first: Somehow I am now in a majority!

* * * * *

Back to the Minority!

Many traditional Catholics appear to believe that the last five antipopes who have practically destroyed the Catholic Church have accomplished this mistakenly, unknowingly, or even accidentally. They had the best of intentions, but those cardinals and bishops, working behind their backs, betrayed them. To believe this one must face the probability that each successor to John XXIII had worked behind the back of his predecessor(s) until he crossed the line into fairyland, where the Holy Ghost guided his actions and guaranteed his doctrine.

We must work on the worst case scenario: these five antipopes knew exactly what they worked so hard to accomplish: ruin of our ordinary means of salvation, our Church, its Mass, sacraments, doctrine, purpose, and faith. We must impute diabolical malice. We must realize that we have been infiltrated from the top, by organized enemies who actually told us what they intended and when. It is utterly impossible that this disaster could have overtaken us by accident. It is too well organized and universally imposed for coincidence. All the traitors were in place to be activated at the Second Vatican Council, which ignored real problems and promoted multiple heresy and wanton destruction, for which no slightest excuse existed.

One cannot destroy the Mystical Body of Christ by accident, or the Church could never have survived nineteen centuries of incompetence. Jesus Christ chose twelve ordinary men to propagate His Gospel, thus showing that the power lies in the message, not in the messenger. The same applies to His Church, which in the normal course of events could never have so long maintained a recognizable existence. What other organization has ever come close? (Judaism? No, it changed its entire base when it rejected its Messiah, and it has since divided, though not to the extent displayed by the Protestants or the postconciliar “Church.”)

Christ’s Mystical Body, we are told, is not greater than its Master, and is to suffer the same death and resurrection. So why not by the same plan—betrayal?

Check Mathew 26:24-25. “The Son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of him. But woe to that man by whom the Son of man shall be betrayed. It were better for him, if that man had not been born. And Judas that betrayed him answering, said: Is it I, Rabbi? He saith to him: Thou hast said it.”

Did Jesus Christ (the Supreme Realist) make excuses for the traitor? Judas betrayed Him mistakenly, unknowingly, accidentally? “Better for him, if [he] had not been born!”

The pope’s job is well defined. Everyone knows it, even the pope. For centuries each pope took the papal oath, to take what had been passed to him by his predecessor and pass it **unchanged** to his successor. The absolute best that can be said of John XXIII, Paul VI, John Paul I, John Paul II, and Benedict XVI is that they deliberately refused and openly violated the terms and purpose of the job they had usurped.

Their only credential: Apostolic Succession from Judas!

* * * * *

The War Is Now! No. 78 December 2009

These two reports culled from the Internet seem more than likely to arouse the ire of the Freemasons—some for exposure of a plot to infiltrate and control the Catholic Church, though the Freemasons themselves publicized this while invading the Papal states—others for impugning the Freemasons’ efficiency and the completeness of their victory. They have not and never will win, but they are rather sure that they have won.

ELEISON COMMENTS CXXI (Oct 31, 2009) VALID BISHOPS?

Confirmation of the Society of St. Pius X’s position on the validity of Newchurch sacraments appeared last week in the bulletin, *Courrier de Tychique*. From a “reliable source” it appears that Freemasonry, ancient enemy of the Church, planned for the Conciliar Revolution to invalidate Catholic sacraments, not by alteration of their Form, rendering them automatically invalid, but by an ambiguity of their rite as a whole, gradually undermining the minister’s necessary sacramental intention.

[They did, however, alter or replace their Forms, rendering them invalid!]

The “reliable source” is a Frenchman who heard directly from a venerable priest some of what Cardinal Lienart on his deathbed confessed to the priest. No doubt fearing Hell, the Cardinal begged the priest to reveal it to the world, and thus released him from the Confessional seal. The priest was thenceforth discreet in public, but in private he was more forthcoming as to what the Cardinal revealed of Freemasonry’s three-point plan for destruction of the Church. Whether or not he entered Freemasonry at age seventeen [If he confessed that, why doubt it? Or why believe the rest?], the Cardinal rendered it supreme service when only two days after Vatican II opened he wrenched the Council off course by his demand that the carefully prepared documents be rejected.

According to the Cardinal, Freemasonry's first objective at Vatican II was to break the Mass by so altering the rite as gradually to undermine the celebrants' intention to do what the Church intends. [**The intention was so utterly removed from the rite that the celebrant's intention can have no effect; the entire ceremony is invalid regardless of the celebrant's intention.**] Gradually the Rite was to induce priests and laymen alike to take the Mass rather for a "memorial" or "sacred meal" than for a propitiatory sacrifice. [**Largely this happened.**]

The second objective was to break the Apostolic Succession by a new rite [**which could not confer the episcopacy**] that would undermine the bishops' power of Orders, both by a new Form not automatically invalidating but ambiguous enough to sow doubt, and above all, by a new Rite which would eventually dissolve the consecrating bishops' sacramental Intention. This would break the Apostolic Succession so gently that no one would notice. [Unless some one listened to the new "bishops.]" Is this not exactly what many believing Catholics now fear? [I believe so, but we need not fear what was immediately accomplished by the changes.]

However "reliable" the "source," Newchurch Rites of "Mass" and Episcopal "Ordination" exactly fit the Masonic plan as unveiled by the Cardinal. Ever since these new Rites were introduced (late sixties, early seventies) many serious Catholics have [correctly] refused to believe in their validity. Alas, they are not automatically invalid [You could have fooled me!] (how much simpler if they were!). They are worse! Their sacramental Form is Catholic enough to persuade many a celebrant that they can be validly used, but they are designed as a whole to be so ambiguous and so suggestive of a non-Catholic interpretation [a rather good definition of invalid] as to invalidate the sacrament over time by corrupting the intention of any celebrant either too "obedient" or insufficiently watching or praying [especially the pedophiles].

Rites thus valid enough to be accepted by nearly all Catholics in the short term, [Has the author checked how many millions stopped going to church when the innovations came? We lost a hundred thousand priests, not all of whom were chasing women.] but ambiguous enough to invalidate the sacraments in the long term, constitute a trap satanically subtle. To avoid it one must shun all contact with these Rites, [He sees the light!] but they must not discredit their sound Catholic instincts [which keep them subject to Lienart's fellow plotters] by exaggerated [!] theological [but logical] accusations [Some one must have done this; it could not have happened by mistake or accident.] which depart [How?] from sound Catholic doctrine. Not always an easy balance to keep.

* * * * *

Kyrie eleison. London, England

[Lack of intention can invalidate a sacrament but proper intention cannot validate a man-made sacramental replacement — a new "sacrament" not instituted by Jesus Christ. I rather suspect that the above interpretation of the facts originated with Richard Williamson, if for no other reason than that he hopes in vain that he is a valid bishop.]

Achille Lienart, Cardinal of Lille, France, admitted on his deathbed that he was a Freemason and had been a leader of the Freemasonic plot at Vatican II. □ To invalidate the traditional mass and priesthood □ Hannibal Bugnini, another Freemason, executed the plot after the council in the imposition of the invalid new Ordinal of 1968 and the *novus ordo* service of 1969.

Readers of these Daily Commentaries of the TRADITIO Fathers may not be aware that shortly after the Conciliar-Bugnini Novus Ordo was imposed in 1969, a prominent cardinal admitted on his deathbed that he was involved in what he called a Freemasonic plot to use the Vatican II Council (1962-1965) to invalidate the Catholic Sacraments by depriving the Mass of its certain validity in the traditional form by invalidating the celebrant's necessary valid Sacramental intention. [This approximates the ridiculous argument that a validly ordained Catholic priest can transubstantiate in the Anglican service.]

Achille Cardinal Lienart, the bishop of Lille, France, confessed on his deathbed in early 1973, his complicity in the plot. This was exactly the method by which the Anglicans after Henry VIII invalidated the Anglican "Mass," which was officially declared invalid by Pope Leo XIII in 1896. Thus, the papal decree of invalidation applies equally to the *Novus Ordo* service. The Vatican II cardinal permitted and, further, instructed his confessor to reveal to the world his deathbed confession, that as a Freemason, he participated in Freemasonry's plot for the destruction of the Catholic Church at the Council:

to invalidate the Mass by so altering the rite as to (1) undermine the celebrant's necessary valid intention, in converting the Mass to a "Sunday dinner" rather than a sacrifice; (2) to break the Apostolic Succession by invalidating the rite of episcopal consecration and invalidating *Novus Ordo* bishops' intention to ordain priests, instead installing Protestantized ministers "to preside over the assembly."

Lienart confessed that the Freemasonic plot was so subtly structured as to lure Catholics into accepting the *Novus Ordo* in the short term as valid, but in fact to invalidate [ate] the Mass and priestly ordinations. Although Lienart executed the Freemasonic plot at Vatican II to invalidate the Sacraments, it was another Freemason, Hannibal Bugnini, who implemented that plot in the *Novus Ordo* Ordinal of 1968 and *Novus Ordo* service of 1969 from his position as Secretary of the Council for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Liturgy.

Actually, Bugnini admitted that his work to impose the *Novus Ordo* had been first implemented in the “Mass of 1962,” calling it in the February 1972 issue of the Roman liturgical periodical *Notitiae*, “essentially a bridge between the old and the new, and if you will, an arrow indicating the direction taken by the current restoration [the *Novus Ordo*].” By his own admission the “Mass of 1962” was intended to introduce *Novus Ordo* principles and soften up clueless Catholics to accept the full-blown *Novus Ordo* service as valid. This Freemasonic and Modernistic foundation is why Traditional Roman Catholics reject the “Mass of 1962,” now known as the “*Motu*” Mass or the “Extraordinary Rite.” For his work, Bugnini received a letter of commendation from the Masonic Worshipful Master of Rome.

* * * * *

QUERY: Tell us **more about Lienart**’s deathbed confession.

REPLY: We have here a deathbed admission from Achille Lienart (whose membership in the Freemasons had automatically excommunicated him from the Catholic Church) that he had actively participated as a Freemason in a successful Freemasonic plot to destroy the Catholic Church from within. This plot was publicly revealed by Mazzini, the Freemason who presided at the destruction of the Papal States, to anyone who could read, including members of both the Catholic Church and of the publicly condemned Freemasons.

Albert Pike, greatest Masonic authority of the last two centuries, the ‘Masonic Pope,’ wrote: “To the crowd we must say: we worship a God but it is the God one adores without superstition. To you, Sovereign Grand Inspectors General, we say this, that you may repeat it to the brethren of the 32nd, 31st and 30th degrees: all of us initiates of the high degrees should maintain the Masonic religion in the purity of the Luciferian doctrine. If Lucifer were not God, would Adonay, the God of the Christians, whose deeds prove his cruelty, perfidy, and hatred of man, his barbarism and repulsion of science, would Adonay and his priests calumniate him? Yes, Lucifer is God, and unfortunately Adonay is also God religious philosophy in its purity and truth consists in the belief in Lucifer, the equal of Adonay.”

J. D. Buck, mentions (**The Genius of Freemasonry**) “a tendency to ‘Christianize’ certain Masonic degrees. Any sectarian or religious bias is wholly un-Masonic and wholly opposed to the real genius of Freemasonry.” (page 34) “The Mason everywhere is an enemy of Popery, because Popery seeks to deny, control, or abrogate every right of citizenship. It denies man’s right to Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness. It is necessary that the basis, the real Genius of these two Institutions, should be clearly understood and accurately distinguished; for they are exact opposites and are antagonistic to the last degree.”

Leo XIII, after outlining the political errors of the Naturalists and stating that the Freemasons agree with these errors to the extent that they have long worked to set up states and governments to fit these errors, continues: “In this mad and wicked design, the implacable thirst for vengeance with which Satan is animated against Our Lord Jesus Christ becomes almost visible to our bodily eyes A complete change and upheaval is being carefully prepared by numerous associations of Communists and Socialists, in fact it is their openly avowed aim; and Freemasonry is not only not opposed to their plans, but looks upon them with the greatest favor, as its leading principles are identical with theirs.” (*Humanum Genus*)

Pius XII (23 May 1958) ascribed the roots of modern apostasy to scientific atheism, dialectical materialism, rationalism, illuminism, laicism, and Freemasonry —the mother of them all.

Achille Lienart entered a Masonic lodge in Cambrai 1912, became “Visitor” in Masonry - 18th degree 1919, arrived at 30th degree 1924. Consecrated bishop December 8, 1928.

For valid reception of Holy Orders it is necessary that the recipient have the intention of receiving the sacrament for the benefit of the Catholic Church and its members. No one excommunicated for sixteen years and holding that Lucifer is equal to Almighty God can pretend to such an intention. If there were room for such a doubt, Lienart’s self-confessed admission to participation in a plot to destroy the Catholic Church with other members of an organization dedicated to that self-admitted purpose utterly destroys the possibility of that doubt. Even if there could be such a doubt, doubt is not permitted in sacramental matters, and all Catholics would be forced to the practical conclusion of invalidity.

We must therefore conclude that:

Even had the Second Vatican Council been properly and legally convoked, it was immediately perverted from all possibility of beneficial effect;

Lienart had no voice or vote in a council of the Catholic Church;

Lienart had no power whatsoever to ordain (**not even Marcel Lefebvre**—there are no co-consecrators at priestly ordinations, and no skips in major orders—if a man is not a priest, no consecration will make him either a priest or a bishop);

Achille was a heel.

Why would Lienart confess such treachery? He was on the point of death; what could the Freemasons do for him now? But God is merciful, no? What could Lienart lose?

* * * * *

On October 26, 2009, the **SSPX's senior bishop, Richard Williamson**, was fined almost 200,000 U.S. dollars by a German court for his statement “inciting racial hatred” during a Swedish Public Television interview on a disputed issue of secular history. A Jewish official associated with Benedict-Ratzinger stated on October 27, 2009, that he would be “very surprised” if the Society of St. Pius X were admitted to Newchurch, as it harbored “holocaust-deniers,” a fact that has upset Jewish radical groups. Rabbi David Rosen, Director of the American Jewish Committee’s Department for Religious Affairs and recently Chairman of the International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations, is closely plugged into Benedict-Ratzinger’s “oecumenical” efforts.

Rosen stated: “Now they [the SSPX bishops and members] are truly under the magnifying glass. In the past they may have been able to slip under the ‘door,’ but after his [Williamson’s] comments, it won’t be so easy to slip in.” The American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors and Their Descendants also issued a public statement, calling on Benedict-Ratzinger to exhibit great caution in the Vatican discussions with Society of Saint Pius X, so as not to touch on the dignity of the Jewish people or to trivialize the memory of the victims of the Shoah.

The SSPX’s superior general, Bernie Fellay, who has gone out of his way to vilify his senior bishop, silenced him, and placed him under virtual house arrest, has not announced whether the SSPX will pay Williamson’s fine and will disavow the “anti-Semitic” statements by its bishops and members that are spread throughout its web sites and publications. The SSPX has condemned Vatican II’s outreach to Jews and to non-Catholic Christians. Absent a complete recantation by Fellay of the SSPX’s founding principles, no “negotiations” will overcome Benedict-Ratzinger’s Prime Directive of Vatican II “Oecumenism.”

[This should clarify Ratzinger’s attitude toward the Catholic Church to which he pretends to adhere. It may even clarify Fellay’s.]

* * * * *

Daddy Bush, in typical underhanded fashion, saddled the American public with the **Noa(c)hide Laws**.

Public Law 102-14 - 102d CONGRESS, 1st Session - H. J. RES. 104 - JOINT RESOLUTION

To designate March 26, 1991, as ‘Education Day , U.S.A.’

Whereas Congress recognizes the historical tradition of ethical values and principles which are the basis of civilized society and upon which our great Nation was founded;

Whereas these ethical values and principles have been the bedrock of society from the dawn of civilization, **when they were known as the Seven Noahide Laws**; [A necessary clause?]

Whereas without these ethical values and principles the edifice of civilization stands in serious peril of returning to chaos;

Whereas society is profoundly concerned with the recent weakening of these principles that has resulted in crises that beleaguer and threaten the fabric of civilized society;

Whereas the justified preoccupation with these crises must not let the citizens of this Nation lose sight of their responsibility to transmit these historical ethical values from our distinguished past to the generations of the future;

Whereas the Lubavitch movement has fostered and promoted these ethical values and principles throughout the world;

Whereas Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, leader of the Lubavitch movement, is universally [?] respected and revered and his eighty-ninth birthday falls on March 26, 1991;

Whereas in tribute to this great spiritual leader, 'the rebbe,' this, his ninetieth year will be seen as one of 'education and giving,' the year in which we turn to education and charity to return [?] the world to the moral and ethical values contained in the Seven Noahide Laws; and

Whereas this will be reflected in an international scroll of honor signed by the President of the United States and other heads of state: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That March 26, 1991, the start of the ninetieth year of Rabbi Menachem Schneerson, leader of the worldwide Lubavitch movement, is designated as 'Education Day, U.S.A.' The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Approved March 20, 1991. Signed by George Bush, President of the United States of America April 7, 1998/Nissan 11, 5758

[So what were the Noahide Laws, given to Noe right after the Flood? Part of God's revealed truth, with which He favored the human race. The next significant revelation came to Abraham, roughly a millennium later. With Moses, eight centuries later, came the Ten Commandments, the Levitical laws, and more. From then on the prophecies became more specific, until when the Magi came, following the Star, they were told where and when to find the Messiah. So our Congress and president proceed to glorify a Rabbi who eliminates all between, and returns us to a time just after all civilization, corrupt as it was, had just been wiped out. We are to survive without all the benefits since accrued. Then we discover that this barely sufficient code is the very same adopted and pushed by the Freemasons as the common ground on which all religions can agree. We tie this to the fact that every religious organization which has ever examined Freemasonry has condemned Freemasonry as hostile to all religion. Then we find that Schneerson and his Lubavitch movement have in view that same end, and that the two millennia later replacement of the Sanhedrin openly embraces the destruction of all competitive religions.]

Thursday, March 22, 2007

Papal Commission Promotes Noahide Laws

[Here a document produced by a joint committee of the Papal Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews and the Chief Rabbinate of "Israel" promotes the rabbi-fabricated Noahide Laws and outrageously suggests that these laws have a Biblical basis, not only in the Old Testament, but in the New Testament as well. Out of thin air, a basis is invented for adoption of Noahide Laws by Christians. Of what possible use is such a Papal Commission? Judaism by definition directly opposes Catholicism in essential doctrine. If a Jew compromises with a Catholic in such areas he is no longer a Jew. If a Catholic compromises with anyone in these areas he is no longer a Catholic. If a joint committee emerges with a compromise, neither group belongs to its original religion, and therefore has represented whom?]

ROME, MARCH 20, 2007 (Zenit.org).- Here is the text of the conclusions from the bilateral commission meeting of the Catholic and Jewish delegations dedicated to improving relations between the two religions.

The Delegation of the Holy See's Commission for **Religious** Relations with the Jews and the Chief Rabbinate of Israel's Delegation for Relations with the Catholic Church -- Bilateral Commission Meeting, Jerusalem, March 11-13, 2007; Adar 21-23, 5767

1. At the seventh meeting of the above commission, held in Jerusalem, the chairmen Cardinal Jorge Mejia and Chief Rabbi Shear Yashuv Cohen ... expressed the hope that the fullness of the relationship between the Catholic and the Jewish members of this commission will be a source of blessing to both faith communities and the world at large. ...

2. The subject of the meeting was the "Freedom of Religion and Conscience and its Limits." The human capacity to choose is a manifestation of the divine image in which all people are created (cf. Gen 1:26-27) and is foundational for the biblical concept of human responsibility and divine justice (cf. Deut 30:19).

3. God has created the human person as a social being which, by definition, places limits on individual human freedom. Moreover freedom of choice is derived from God and therefore is not absolute, but must reflect divine will and law. Accordingly human beings are called to freely obey the divine will as manifested in Creation and in his revealed word.

Jewish tradition emphasizes the Noahide Covenant (cf. Gen 9:9-12)

[9:9-15. Behold I will establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you: And with every living soul that is with you, as well in all birds, as in cattle and beasts of the earth, that are come forth out of the ark, and in all the beasts of the earth. I will establish my covenant with you, and all flesh shall be no more destroyed with the waters of a flood, neither shall there be from henceforth a flood to waste the earth. And God said: This is the sign of the covenant which I give between me and you, and to every living soul that is with you, for perpetual generations. I will set my bow in the clouds, and it shall be the sign of a covenant between me and between the earth. And when I shall cover the sky with clouds, my bow shall appear in the clouds: And I will remember my covenant with you, and with every living soul that beareth flesh: and there shall no more be waters of a flood to destroy all flesh. (This resembles the Noachide Laws?)]

as containing the universal moral code which is incumbent on all humanity. This idea is reflected in Christian scripture in the book of Acts 15:28-29. [15:28.-29. For it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay no further burden upon you than these necessary things: That you abstain from things sacrificed to idols and from blood and from things strangled and from fornication: from which things keeping yourselves, you shall do well. Fare ye well.]

4. Accordingly the idea of moral relativism is antithetical to this religious worldview and poses a serious threat to humanity. Even though the Enlightenment helped bring about a purification from the abuse of religion, secular society still requires religious foundations to sustain lasting moral values. Critical among these is the principle of the sanctity of human life and dignity. Ethical monotheism affirms these as inviolable human rights and therefore can provide inspiration in this regard for society at large.

5. While on principle the state should not at all limit freedom of religion for individuals and communities nor of moral conscience, it has the responsibility to guarantee the well-being and security of society. Accordingly it is obliged to intervene wherever and whenever a threat is posed by the promotion, teaching, or exercise of violence and specifically terrorism and psychological manipulation in the name of religion.

6. In addition to respecting the freedom of religious choices, the integrity of faith communities should also be guaranteed. Accordingly it is legitimate for a society with a predominant religious identity to preserve its character, as long as this does not limit the freedom of minority communities and individuals to profess their alternative religious commitments, nor to limit their full civil rights and status as citizens, individuals and communities. This obliges us all to safeguard the integrity and dignity of holy sites, places of worship and cemeteries of all religious communities.

7. In the course of history, religious communities have not always been faithful to these values. Therefore there is a special obligation upon religious leaders and communities to prevent the improper use of religion and to educate towards respect for diversity which[?] is essential in order to ensure a healthy, stable and peaceful society. [As in Palestine?]

In this regard, there is a special role for families, schools and the authorities of state and society as well as the media to impart these values to future generations.

In conclusion the bilateral commission having met in the Holy City of Jerusalem, expressed the prayer that the Almighty would bless and inspire both religious and political leaders in the region and beyond, to work determinedly to promote peace, dignity, security and tranquility in the Holy Land for all its peoples and for the world as a whole. [How long since these agreements?]

Jerusalem, March 13, 2007 -- Adar 23, 5767

Chief Rabbi Shear Yashuv Cohen (Chairman of the Jewish Delegation) & others

Jorge Cardinal Mejia (Chairman of the Catholic Delegation) & others

The Seven Noahide Laws

Part 1

The following are the seven commandments, comprising six negative precepts and one positive.

Idolatry is forbidden. [Capitol crime!] Man is commanded to believe in the One G-d alone and worship only Him. [Jews are Jews because they deny the divinity of Jesus Christ. All who worship Him are "guilty!"]

Incestuous and adulterous relations are forbidden. Human beings are not sexual objects, nor is pleasure the ultimate goal of life.

Murder is forbidden. The life of a human being, formed in G-d's image, is sacred.

Cursing the name of G-d is forbidden. Besides honoring and respecting G-d, we learn from this precept that our speech must be sanctified, as that is the distinctive sign which separated man from the animals.

Theft is forbidden. The world is not ours to do with as we please.

Eating the flesh of a living animal is forbidden. This teaches us to be sensitive to cruelty to animals. (This was commanded to Noah for the first time along with the permission of eating meat. The rest were already given to Adam in the Garden of Eden.) [So the Rabbis reason.]

Mankind is commanded to establish courts of justice and a just social order to enforce the first six laws and enact any other useful laws or customs.

“These seven laws are implicit in God's commandment to Adam and Eve in Gen. 2:16-17, “And the Lord God commanded the man saying ‘From all the trees of the garden you may freely eat.’”

A ... goal of the ... Sanhedrin's efforts in regard to the Noahide [non-Jewish] community, is to “transform the Noahide movement from a religious phenomenon - **a curiosity many have not heard of** - into a powerful international movement that can successfully compete with, and with G-d's help bring about the fall of, any (other) religious movement ...” [Traditional Catholics are not a movement.]

Crux rei

What says **Ratzi**? He **has examined the entire Old Testament**, the history of God's covenant to send a Savior to redeem the human race—the prophetic revelation as it increased and multiplied until even the date and time were specified. So when the old covenant had been fulfilled, and the Savior established a new covenant, the people to whom He came could reject Him, according to Ratzi, and hold out for a better deal. And their rejection justified their persecution of that large segment of the people who gratefully embraced the new covenant which their Savior had mercifully provided. And Ratzi does everything possible to avoid his office's purpose to convert the active recalcitrants, and to facilitate their baseless vigil. Considering the real problems facing the Church, even the time he wastes in these useless activities is criminal.

The entire situation and the way in which he treats it prove beyond doubt that Ratzi is an active enemy of Jesus Christ and His Holy Catholic Church wherever it survives—no thanks to him.

God, according to Ratzi, has two covenants simultaneously effective to suit religious preference. But either the Savior has come or He hasn't. If the old covenant remains in effect, those who have rejected Jesus Christ are correct and we Catholics are wrong. Even Ratzinger must know this. And he's pope?

What more proof is needed that the Catholic Church of nineteen centuries has been taken over by those bent on only its utter destruction? If we cannot identify the enemy we must throw in the towel and somehow identify apostasy as God's will.

Amazing Versatility

is again demonstrated by the current usurper. If Ratzinger be not all things to all men, it is not for lack of effort. At the same time that he solicits all the Anglicans disaffected by open toleration of unnatural vices by some of their hierarchy, just as if the straight men could accept the even more notorious sodomites and pederasts in charge of Benny's infamous church-substitute, he appeals to traditional Catholics to listen to the inspired message of St. Bernard of Clairvaux. We are to disregard such minor matters as shameless robbery of our ordinary means of salvation and return to prayer, presumably in union with the robbers—“the family that prays together stays together.” But what happens to the family when the father replaces traditional prayer with innovative idolatry?

Benny mentions St. Bernard's letter to his fellow Cistercian, Pope Eugene III, on how to be a good pope, just as though Benny himself had read it. St. Bernard probably had some concept of a pope's proper functions. He had certainly devoted great effort to removal of antipope Anacletus II.

VATICAN CITY (Reuters) - Pope Benedict wasted his New Year address to call on people to change their lifestyles to save the planet, saying **environmental responsibility** was essential for global peace. [One would have thought that **moral responsibility** is essential to peace, global or local.]

Recalling that world leaders had gathered in Copenhagen last month for the U.N. climate conference [irrelevant unless government can control the climate!], the pope said action at a personal and community

level was just as important [as what?] to safeguard the environment. [Self control? Must we quit smoking tobacco, opium, and pot?]

“Nevertheless, in this moment, I would like to underline the importance of the choices of individuals, families and local administrations in preserving the environment,” the Pope told the thousands gathered in St. Peter’s Square.

“An objective shared by all, an indispensable condition for peace, is that of overseeing [clear implication of force and control] the earth’s natural resources with justice and wisdom.” [attributes common to governments and politicians!]

The pope also said “ecological responsibility” should be taught as part of the education syllabus. [along with such other essentials as sex training and evolution.]

The pope and his predecessor John Paul have put the Vatican firmly on an environmentalist footing. Last month, in a message sent to heads of state and international organizations, the pope called on rich nations to acknowledge responsibility for the environmental crisis [global warming] and to shed consumerism.

Reuters July 7, 2009

Pope Benedict on Tuesday called for a “world political authority” to manage the global economy and for more government regulation of national economies to pull the world out of the current crisis and avoid a repeat.

The pope’s call for a re-think of the way the world economy is run came in a new encyclical which touched on a number of social issues but whose main connecting thread was how the current crisis has affected both rich and poor nations.

Called “Charity in Truth,” parts of the encyclical appeared bound to upset conservatives because of its underlying rejection of unbridled capitalism and unregulated market forces, which he said had led to “thoroughly destructive” abuse of the system.

Pope Benedict XVI spoke to the U.N. General Assembly, warning nations against undermining the authority of the United Nations by acting unilaterally. [As in plundering the Palestinians? Or was that bilateral action?] The Pope also found time to **bless the U.N. flag**. [Some one’s gotta do it! Who better than a non-member?]

Reuters reports, “Countries that act unilaterally on the world stage undermine the authority of the United Nations and weaken the broad consensus needed to confront global problems.” The international community must be “capable of responding to the demands of the human family through binding international rules,” said the 81-year-old pope, who spoke after meeting privately with U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon.

He said the notion of multilateral consensus was “in crisis because it is still subordinated to the decisions of a few, whereas the world’s problems call for interventions in the form of collective action by the international community.”

We see here in verbal action the expert on humanity and its inherent rights, backing up the tyranny of super-government according to the sainted New World Order, which supplants local governments supposedly sensitive to needs of their own constituents with deadly conformism which reduces all men to a common herd of ineffective proletarians (then reduces even that aspect to race suicide), and pontificating on how to run the world [secular Ecumenism], while he continues without interruption the destruction of the mother of our civilization, the Catholic Church.

It was my privilege to know an extraordinary violinist, who said: “If you hear a musician faulting the performance of another musician, you may take it as evidence that he himself is not practicing.” When will Benedict say something—anything!—to promote Catholicism? In his decades in charge of the new Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, what rampant heresy or crime of sodomy or pederasty has he tried to remedy?

* * * * *

Priestly Ordination Form

Dr. Ludwig Pastor’s exhaustive **History of the Popes from the Later Middle Ages** starts from the Church’s “Babylonian captivity” in Avignon, France from 1305 to 1376. Volume I covers Eugene IV (pp

282-361, third edition, English translation) who held the office from 1431 to 1447 A.D. His was an eventful reign. He was the last pope to find it necessary to flee Rome until Pius IX. This is one reason why the Council he convoked was held at Ferrara and transferred to Florence.

I quote from page 286 of the aforesaid Volume I: “Some of his relations came to him, but they received no part of the temporal goods of the Church, *for he held that he could not give away that which did not belong to him.*” Please contrast this attitude with that of our last five antipopes, who dialogue with all non-Catholics in desertion of all certainties in order to swindle them into “full membership” in our negotiable ecumenical brotherhood.

The Council of Florence received several schismatic groups back into the Catholic Church. In Denzinger’s Handbook of Creeds (*Enchiridion Symbolorum*) is found a lengthy excerpt from the Bull *Exultate Deo*: “we have reduced under this very brief formula the truth of the sacraments of the Church for the sake of an easier instruction of the Armenians, ...” (Denz. 695-702) In 696 we find three forms for proper conferral of Baptism; in 697 one form for Confirmation used then and until its replacement after the Second Vatican Council with a form never used in any rite; in 698 the prescription that the Armenians use the words of Jesus Christ for Consecration of the Holy Eucharist; in 699 the form *ego te absolvo*, etc. for Penance; in 700 the fourteen-word (in Latin) form used repeatedly (for each sense) to confer Extreme Unction; and in 701 the specific form for priestly ordination, as then used in Rome from time immemorial:

“*Receive the power of offering sacrifice in the Church for the living and the dead, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.*” This is the quintessence, and chief purpose, of the priesthood. Who can imagine a council convoked by a pope with the attitude attributed to him by such a reliable and thorough historian misinforming a returning schismatic group on a matter of such importance by inventing a new sacramental form for the occasion? Where else did Eugene IV and his Council of Florence vary from well-known sacramental practice?

What greater authority had Pius XII to replace this sacramental form in his 1947 *Sacramentum ordinis* by substituting a long Preface from the same ceremony? Was not Pius’ reason for the change — that the words designated as the sacramental form by his predecessor do not occur in the Eastern rites of ordination— a *non sequitur* bordering on absurdity, especially in view of variations in form of Baptism and Confirmation between the Latin and Eastern rites? Had not Pius XII stated in the same *Sacramentum ordinis*: “As the Council of Trent teaches, the seven sacraments of the New Law have all been instituted by Jesus Christ, Our Lord, and the Church has no power over the substance of the sacraments?” Was Pius XII, who had never spent a day in a seminary and whose entire career was spent in administrative capacities— including time as Rampolla’s secretary— a more competent sacramental theologian than Eugene IV and the Council of Florence? Whether or not the earlier statement included in Denzinger’s Handbook of Creeds was infallibly proclaimed, how is another statement on the same subject, also not addressed to the entire Church, to be accorded infallibility? Or credibility?

Pius XII at least ordered that no change be made in the existing rite of ordination. So whichever words constituted the form, both sets were used with the proper intention— until replacement of the sacrament in 1968 and universal imposition of the novelty along with the introduction of the new order “mass.” Bugnini’s invention removed every trace of Eugene IV’s *Tradition of the Instruments* and modified Pius XII’s *Preface*.

Let me cite **Is The Pope Catholic?**, pages 109-110, wherein I quoted “Owen Roberts,” later revealed as Michael Davies: Leo XIII ruled the intention of the Anglican ordination rite defective because the form was not intended to ordain sacrificing priests in the Catholic sense of the term, that the prayers “have been deliberately stripped of everything which, in the Catholic rite, clearly sets forth the dignity and function of the priesthood. It is impossible, therefore, for a form to be suitable or sufficient for a sacrament if it suppresses that which it ought to signify.” The intention of the new rite was to make a man not a sacrificing priest, but a “faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His holy sacraments,” a phrase used by the continental reformers to describe the Protestant ministry in opposition to the Catholic priesthood.

The Anglican archbishops objected. The Catholic hierarchy of England and Wales issued **A Vindication of the Bull “*Apostolicae Curae.*”** They decried the very idea of reforming or omitting “anything in those forms which immemorial tradition has bequeathed to us. For such an immemorial usage, whether or not it has in the course of centuries incorporated superfluous accretions, must in the estimation of those who believe in a divinely guarded visible Church, at least have retained what is necessary; so that in adhering rigidly to the rite handed down to us we can always feel secure; whereas, if we omit or change anything, we may perhaps abandon just that element which is essential. And this sound method is that which the Catholic Church has always followed That in earlier times local churches were permitted to add new prayers and

ceremonies is acknowledged but that they were permitted to subtract prayers and ceremonies in previous use, and even to remodel the existing rite in the most drastic manner is a proposition for which we know of no historical foundation, and which appears to us absolutely incredible. Hence Cranmer in taking this unprecedented course acted, in our opinion, with the most inconceivable rashness.”

Catholic historians of the Reformation (e.g., Hughes, Messenger, Clark) lay special emphasis on Cranmer’s technique of introducing doctrinal innovation through the liturgy, not by explicitly heretical statements, but by omission of prayers and ceremonies irreconcilable with Protestant doctrine. Their judgment is unanimous—what is not affirmed is denied. [omitted = not affirmed]

The old rite has been remodelled in the most drastic manner, principally by subtraction of prayers and ceremonies in previous use, notably those specifying the traditional (Tridentine) definition of a Catholic priest—ordained to consecrate, offer sacrifice, and forgive sins. The new rite follows the very pattern for which Pope Leo XIII condemned Cranmer’s ordination rite as invalid. (so far Roberts-Davies)

Please recall that the rite was condemned for its form; celebrants’ intention was neither considered nor relevant. So it is with Annibale Bugnini’s mass and ordination substitutes.

Back to Pius XII: We see, then, that he had neither business nor power to change a sacramental form, specifically the form of priestly ordination. The only excuse I have ever heard for this unwarranted and unnecessary act is that Eugene IV did not state his definition infallibly because he addressed, not the whole Church, but only the returning Armenians, from whom he therefore presumably withheld the correct form — which is almost as silly a reason as the lack of these words in other rites. But Pius XII published his “correction” to only the Latin Rite, not to the entire Church, so where is his correctional infallibility? Popes, we hear, have equal authority. But a later pope cannot correct earlier popes in doctrinal matters; in the papal oath each pope vows to accept all from his predecessor and pass it unchanged to his successor. So what was Pius XII’s reason? Had it something to do with his early assignment to the staff of that Masonic monster, Rampolla, vetoed (1903) by Franz Josef when his election to the papacy appeared inevitable? It certainly opened the whole vital ordination field to the modernist reformers. And this is why Catholics have few bishops and fewer young priests in the Latin Rite.

* * * * *

Separation of Church and Economics(and of a seminarian from his vocation)

A young seminarian, visiting at North American College Rectory in Rome, Italy, in May 1979 was having wine with seminarians, priests, and cardinals. Cardinal John Krol, Archbishop of Philadelphia, great scholar (eleven languages) and great friend of John Paul II, after having a few drinks, advised this promising young man:

“If you want to be a good church administrator, you need to be a good businessman, like me, and forget about all that spiritual, bible, Jesus crap.”

* * * * *

The Reform of the Liturgy 1948-1975, Annibale Bugnini, Titular Archbishop of Diocletiana, who in 934 translated pages reported greater damage to the Catholic Church than Diocletian, who had persecuted the Church into the longest papal interregnum before the twentieth century.

Bugnini wrote this infamous record, just as though he had some right or competence in deformation of the liturgy, in an overblown hagiographical style highly unsuitable to its coprological content.

Early he attributed to Cardinal Lercaro a “transparent soul.” He may have meant “translucent”; some things suffer in translation. He made it quite clear that he often appealed to the “authority” of Paul VI, who had appointed Bugnini to his own prestigious position. He even dropped the name of Knox, arguably Australia’s stupidest prelate, who headed his Congregation in its quest for episcopal approval of the new “mass.”

Page 88: “The Congregation for Divine Worship was continually accused of causing the evils ... afflicting the Church, of fostering a lack of discipline, of yielding to arrogant pressures ..., and of [inability to] put down abuses. There were points at which these outbursts of anger became rather violent: translations, ... communion in the hand, ... Eucharistic Prayers. The Congregation was forced continually to justify its actions.” [Justification is needed only for innovation.]

He filled another ten pages with denials that his useless, unnecessary, but imposed, invalidating innovations had emptied the churches. The “pope” saw it his way; experiments continued. But no one considered return to the system that had worked for nineteen centuries.

The message that emerges from pp. 99-113 on the terrible confusion caused by introduction of the vernaculars to the Mass is that it was deliberate. There were any number of accurate translations in available bi-lingual Missals, but not one of them satisfied either the Congregation or the Episcopal Conferences, both in themselves useless novelties. No one has yet improved on columnist Bob Considine's requirement that our translations should have been done by some one who understood Latin and English.

Pp. 114-122 detail the acme of confusion to both text and rubrics of the Missal, to the point where two books replaced the Traditional Missal, incorporating so many changes that only a few realized that some of them had invalidated the Mass, leaving the worshippers in full possession of idolatry.

By this time priests were leaving their assignments in thousands. Just to ensure that the deserted worshippers would have even less opportunities to worship, and to keep themselves employed, Bugnini & Company introduced concelebration, for which exists no possible excuse.

Pp. 277-301 grossly misrepresent the Catholic "Opposition." Bugnini ferociously assaults our methods, our disloyalty to unprecedented innovation, our accusations of heresy against him and his boss, our misguided preference for traditional and defined doctrine and worship, our disobedience to incompetent authority and the heretics who have usurped all offices in the formerly Catholic Church, our unreasoned anger at being robbed of our ordinary means of salvation, and uses every possible weapon against us except direct and rational replies to our complaints and accusations. On page 292 he quoted what Cardinal Ottaviani supposedly had said, then criticized Ottaviani's inconsistency in what he had supposed Ottaviani had said. At no point had Bugnini admitted that his entire effort toward a new form of worship violated the liturgical law of the Church as promulgated when it became necessary in the face of the Protestant revolt to guarantee our Holy Mass for all time against all heedless change, and to privilege all priests forever to its exclusive use. Nevertheless, Bugnini's group and the incompetent papal "authority" behind it forbade what everyone in the world acknowledged as official Catholic worship. Bugnini ended this chapter: "**Ordinaries cannot grant permission to use the old Missal in Masses with a congregation. Under no pretext can this be allowed. The notification represented a further clarification, but it did not suffice to do away with the difficulties. Some found ways of splitting hairs over it; others considered it an act of persecution. Documents, no matter how solemn, are ineffective against bad faith. People will find all kinds of justifications to defend their actions against those in authority.**" [Talk about hanging oneself!]

Next came changes in the Calendar (pp.305-326), the Litany of Saints (327-330), and the Commons. Embedded in The Order of Mass is a detailed account of the only showing of the *novus ordo missae* to bishops on whom it would be saddled, October 24, 1967. It finished: "... **experiment was not a success and even that it had an effect contrary to the one intended and played a part in the negative vote that followed. Few of the Fathers were disposed and ready for the experiment; ... The majority ... entered the Sistine Chapel with their minds made up and ill-disposed to the new Mass.**" [Normal enough attitude!]

Pp. 491-570 record the massacre of the Breviary.

Certain dioceses and religious communities have had their own variations on the Latin rite. There existed a real danger that a true Mass might survive, but Bugnini & Co. plugged this loophole effectively (pp.571-576).

Pp. 579-723 cover man-made substitutes for Sacraments. Absurdities warrant no emergency reports; we can discuss such matters at any time, hopefully in the coming year.

This volume provides an insight, though not too clear, into the lengths and methods that can be explored in efforts to remain on the payroll. It is essentially one man's monument to himself and his lifetime of useless achievement. It was almost necessary that he himself would write it. No one else could have cared. He succeeded admirably in carrying out the last full measure of devoted hatred for us all.

It is hardly a matter of wonder that a man who had so destroyed himself and was then deprived of the kudos accruing to his monstrous deeds should have hanged himself.

* * * * *

It would appear **inconceivable that a Catholic properly educated in the Catholic religion** could tolerate removal and replacement of the ordinary means of salvation, not only the Mass and sacraments, but the unchangeable doctrine which we must hold to be saved. It is not as though we were never taught these things and could therefore hold to false worship and doctrine in good faith. We know our obligations and the penalties for shirking, ignoring, or failing them.

We know that our clergy and hierarchy are equally, if not more, obliged, due to their more comprehensive education and their duty to educate and minister to the laity. Why have they, almost unanimously, failed to resist the satanic infiltration of our religion, and participated in destruction of their and our ordinary means?

Obviously we were infiltrated from the top; but the ground was necessarily prepared by large-scale infiltration of clergy and hierarchy, often right back to the seminary. The treason prospered till none dared call it treason.

The traitors govern the “Church.” This could not have come about by accident. It is useless to appeal to “popes” and their appointed hierarchy. They hate us enough to damn us. The results are in; the thesis is proven.

At least we have a precedent. When Anacletus II was declared an antipope, all his laws and appointments were voided—he had had no authority to make them.

Why can this precedent not be civilly applied? Why, for instance, may a head of government who has damaged the state not be ruled an *antiprime minister*, *antiking*, *antimayor*, *antigovernor*, or *antipresident*, and have all his laws, taxes, appointments, and establishments voided?

It’s all the same plot. Why not the same remedy?

* * * * *

I am told that I paint a **terrible picture of church and secular governments which are out to kill us**. This is the picture, painted or not.

The Catholic Church is currently governed by usurpers who have done their best to destroy the Church’s purpose to furnish the ordinary means of salvation to those who seek them, while trying to increase the number of seekers, according to God’s plan and Revelation.

Most political entities, including federal governments, pursue the elimination of all freedom, private enterprise, and prosperity, by means of destruction of all who dissent from the all-invasive interference of secular government in moral issues, proper to religion and family, both pre-existent to all governments. Two of their most effective weapons are so-called public debt and the extortion which goes by the euphemistic(?) name of taxation. In the United States of America we have come to the point where there seems no way out of utter financial collapse and probable invasion by our “creditors.”

But we can’t revolt; we have the government which we elected. This means that we are subject to the results of elections in which over half the eligible voters abstained because there were no candidates for whom they could vote, and because the elections were predetermined by the owners of the notoriously programmable voting machines.

What is the solution? Civil disobedience played a large part in excluding the major trouble-maker from India. But it did not solve all India’s problems. The United States must look back to the War of 1812 to find justification for participation in a war or police action.

The Church solution is found in the Bible, specifically in St. Paul’s Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, Chapter 2, verse 14: **Therefore, brethren, stand fast: and hold the traditions, which you have learned, whether by word or by our epistle.**

The financial solution should exist. It just may be that advocated by WalterBurien@cafr1.com. Look it over. Make up your own mind. But it’s the only positive course of action I’ve seen.

* * * * *

I hope I have made it clear that I never use the content of non-Scriptural prognostication as an argument. But now and then I encounter a prophecy worth passing on. The law of averages would seem to indicate that not all prophets are wrong. Try this one.

From “**The Apocalypse of St. John**” Written in the 1920s by Fr. E. Sylvester Berry

Satan will first attempt to destroy the power of the papacy and bring about the downfall of the Church through heresies, persecutions and schisms that surely must follow. He will raise up antichrists and his Prophet to lead the faithful into error and destroy those who remain steadfast. (The faithful will be led astray by attacking the papacy.) [the office and its occupation—H. G.]

It is a matter of history that the most disastrous periods for the church are times when the papal throne is vacant or when anti-popes contended with the legitimate head of the Church. Thus will it also be in those evil days to come. As indicated by his resemblance to a lamb, the false prophet will probably set himself up

in Rome as sort of an anti-pope during the vacancy of the papal throne. At the time of the French Revolution “the abomination of desolation” was wrought in many Catholic Churches by heretics and apostates who broke altars, scattered the relics of martyrs and desecrated the Blessed Sacrament. Such things thus faintly foreshadow the abominations that will desecrate Catholic churches in those sorrowful days when antichrists will see themselves at the altar. The Antichrist and his Prophet will introduce ceremonies that imitate the sacraments of the Church. In fact there will be a complete organization, a Church of Satan, set up in opposition of the Church of Christ. Satan's prophet will usurp the role of the Pope. Their ceremonies will counterfeit the sacraments. (end of excerpts)

This is what one clerical student of Scripture, in the days when *nihil obstat* and *imprimatur* meant something, extracted from the Apocalypse.

* * * * *

Vanishing Characteristics of Belief

Everywhere we hear that the necessity for a dogmatic belief, the profession of a fixed creed, the certainty of any doctrines whatever that have a right to command the submission of the human understanding, slips away increasingly from the minds of men. The cold sophistry of certain men, esteemed by not a few as the thinkers of the age, has gone so far as to proclaim that God cannot be known by man [a la Paul VI], and that all left for man is to reverence in some negative way what he can neither approach nor understand. God is to be sent into exile from the world that He has created, and the creature may no longer know his Creator. Dreadful it is to reflect that such a notion has found a following [Paul VI]. But once throw aside the Church's divine authority and replace it with man's private opinion, and what is there that man will not substitute for God's revealed truth? What truth implanted in our nature will not be driven off by the pride of self-opinion?

In so diseased a general mental condition, if a Catholic bishop speaks of the absolute necessity of faith, and of submission to the divine authority implanted by Christ in the Church, there arises an outcry of priestly tyranny and usurpation. If he quotes the solemn anathemas of the Church—only following the example of our Lord and His Apostles—his language is maliciously reduced to the level of profane cursing.

Yet can Almighty God be indifferent to what men say of Him? Does He really not care what is thought or believed about His divine nature, or about the descent from heaven of His only-begotten Son to work our redemption, about the grace by which He has deigned to save us, or about the authority that He has placed on earth to guide us? To reject God's truth is to reject the God of truth.

[The foregoing, minimally edited from the 1875 Advent message of Archbishop Ullathorne of Birmingham, addresses problems of the Church in increasingly secularized England. Please take note that we face the same problems today, not from Ullathorne's non-Catholic environment, but from Rome via the “authority” of the postconciliar “Catholic” Church.]

* * * * *

The diocese of Wilmington, Delaware, declared bankruptcy on October 18, 2009. Three months later it has petitioned the U.S. Federal Bankruptcy Court for permission to pay \$10,000 monthly to five pederasts defrocked because of proof of sex crimes against children.

The latest of the five repeatedly perpetrated sexual assaults upon children between the beginning of Vatican II (1962) and 1993. In an April 2009 deposition, he admitted having assaulted so many children that he couldn't remember them all!

For the first time a diocese has requested a court's permission to pay off a sex criminal. “Bishop” Malooly, perverting Catholic doctrine, termed the outrageously immoral payoff a “corporal work of mercy.”

Why ask a court? Can't Malooly fund his own mercy? Or does he expect personal subjection to like charges?

Benny the Rat has graciously permitted his church of the New Order during this liturgical year (2010) a **new vestment color: “rainbow,” universally associated with the sodomite “gay-pride” movement.** Benny personally ratified the use of the “gay” rainbow color upon his return from his Africa junket, March 17-23, 2009.

Multicolored vestments with none of the traditional colors predominating have been prohibited in the Roman Church for 1600 years.

Rainbow-colored chasubles and stoles are to be used by Novus Ordo presbyters and lay-deacons for the

34th, 35th, and 36th Sundays of Ordinary Time, as the *Novus Ordo* calls them, which, by papal decree will be replaced with three Sunday-holydays fabricated for the “Covenant of God and His people” of St. Noah, St. Abraham, and St. Moses. [They’ll canonize anyone these days.]

Rainbow chasubles were officially approved for use at JPII’s World Youth Day in Paris (1997). Subsequently New-church’s Congregation for the Divine Cult and Discipline of the Sacraments allowed its world-wide use *ad experimentum*. Since consulting Newbishops and liturgiac “experts,” the Congregation has received rave reviews of the rainbow color, and Newrome’s last Synod of Bishops officially approved stoles and chasubles in rainbow for the three new holydays by a vote of 256-2-1.

Clearly Benny uses rainbow-colored vestments to symbolize approval of “gay pride,” while verbally he mildly objects. It fits neatly into the Modernist program of this New Order cult-member, whom the deaf, dumb, and blind call “traditional.” [Excised from Traditio website]

* * * * *

‘*Anglicanorum Coetibus*’

“In recent times the Holy Spirit has moved groups of Anglicans to petition repeatedly and insistently to be received into full Catholic communion individually as well as corporately. The Apostolic See has responded favorably to such petitions. Indeed, the successor of Peter, mandated by the Lord Jesus to guarantee the unity of the episcopate and to preside over and safeguard the universal communion of all the Churches, I could not fail to make available the means necessary to bring this holy desire to realization.” [Why not? Has Ratzki not failed everything else? When Anglicans, individually or corporately are received into **full** (Is this an implication that they now enjoy **partial**?) Catholic communion, they will surely realize that, especially if they are sincere, they have nothing in common with Ratzki.]

The Church, a people gathered into the unity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit,² (Cf. Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium*, 4; Decree *Unitatis redintegratio*, 2. [Without those Vatican II documents how would we define our Church?]) was instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, as “a sacrament – a sign and instrument, that is, of communion with God and of unity among all people.”³ (Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium*, 1.) □ Every division [most visibly the post-Vatican II “church”] among the baptized in Jesus Christ wounds that which the Church is and that for which the Church exists; in fact, “such division [Whose?] openly contradicts the will of Christ, scandalizes the world, and damages that most holy cause, the preaching the Gospel [long since abandoned by the Vatican II “church”] to every creature.”⁴ (Decree *Unitatis redintegratio*, 1.) Precisely for this reason, before shedding his blood for the salvation of the world, the Lord Jesus prayed to the Father for the unity of his disciples.⁵ (Cf. Jn 17:20-21; [17:20. “And not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in me. 21. That they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.” Dom Bernard Orchard comments: “What Jesus asks for them is unity—a unity of souls, imitative of the Divine Trinity (and, no doubt, a social unity of bodies in which St. Cyril sees the effect of the Holy Eucharist)—a unity which will be a proof to the world that God is here.” This unity, then, clearly implies adherence to undiluted divine truth, on which no non-Catholic sect agrees with the Catholic Church—or it would be Catholic. So what is its relevance to the compromise promoted in the present papal bull? Thus unity characterizes and identifies His disciples; but where is it found in the postconciliar “church?”] Decree *Unitatis redintegratio*, 2.)

It is the Holy Spirit, the principle of unity, which establishes the Church as a communion.⁶ (Cf. Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium*, 13.) □ He is the principle of the unity of the faithful in the teaching of the Apostles, in the breaking of the bread and in prayer.⁷ (Cf. *ibid*; Acts 2:42. [And they were persevering in the doctrine of the apostles and in the communication of the breaking of bread and in prayers.]) The Church, however, analogous to the mystery of the Incarnate Word, is not only an invisible spiritual communion, but is also visible;⁸ (Cf. Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium*, 8; Letter *Communione notio*, 4.) in fact, “the society structured with hierarchical organs and the Mystical Body of Christ, the visible society and the spiritual community, the earthly Church and the Church endowed with heavenly riches, are not to be thought of as two realities. On the contrary, they form one complex reality formed from a two-fold element, human and divine.”⁹ (Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium*, 8.) The communion of the baptized in the teaching of the Apostles and in the breaking of the eucharistic bread is visibly manifested in the bonds of the profession of the faith in its entirety, of the celebration of all of the sacraments instituted by Christ [and replaced by Freemasons], and of the governance of the [innovative] College of [sodomite] Bishops united with its head, the Roman Pontiff.¹⁰ (Cf. CIC, can. 205; Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium*, 13; 14; 21; 22;)

This single Church of Christ, which we profess in the Creed as one, holy, catholic and apostolic “**subsists in**” [an innovative public heresy in an approved Vatican II Dogmatic Constitution promulgated by antipope Paul VI; correctly stated, This single Church of Christ “**is**”] the Catholic Church, which is [normally] governed by the successor of Peter and by the Bishops in communion with him.

Nevertheless, many elements of **sanctification** [another heresy] and of truth are found outside her visible confines. Since these are gifts properly belonging to the Church of Christ, they are forces impelling towards Catholic unity.”¹¹ (Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium*, 8.) [On the contrary, this misconception encourages schismatics to remain in schism.] In the light of these ecclesiological principles, this Apostolic Constitution provides the general normative structure for regulating the institution and life of Personal Ordinariates for those Anglican faithful who desire to enter into the **full** communion of the Catholic Church in a corporate manner [dragging their tails behind them]. This Constitution is completed by Complementary Norms issued by the Apostolic See.

I. §1 Personal Ordinariates for Anglicans entering into full communion with the Catholic Church are erected by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith within the confines of the territorial boundaries of a particular Conference of Bishops in consultation with that same Conference.

§2 Within the territory of a particular Conference of Bishops, one or more Ordinariates may be erected as needed.

§3 Each Ordinarate possesses public juridic personality by the law itself (*ipso iure*); it is juridically comparable to a diocese.¹² (Cf. John Paul II, Ap. Const. *Spirituali militum curae*, 21 April 1986, I § 1.)

§4 The Ordinarate is composed of lay faithful, clerics and members of Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life, originally belonging to the Anglican Communion and now in full communion with the Catholic Church, or those who receive the Sacraments of Initiation within the jurisdiction of the Ordinarate.

§5 **The Catechism of the Catholic Church** is the authoritative expression of the Catholic faith professed by members of the Ordinarate. [This equals definition of Ordinarate as heretical, in professing a set of beliefs held nowhere at any time prior to the Second Vatican Council . These glaring novelties constitute more than one fourth of the Catechism’s content, and were published mostly to affirm and impose the impossible doctrines of that pastoral (therefore fallible) Second Vatican Council] Beyond this, treatment of all its other inconsistencies is superfluous, a waste of time, and work of supererogation. . . .

□ Given in Rome, at St. Peter’s, on November 4, 2009, the Memorial of St. Charles Borromeo. □
□ **BENEDICTUS PP XVI** □ [Competent Authority?] □

One can often determine the value, authority, and purpose of postconciliar publications from Rome by consulting their footnotes, to note what authority is presumed by the authors. *Anglicanorum coetibus* cites its supporting texts nineteen times. Only two citations pre-existed the Second Vatican Council, and they are misapplied to accommodate dialogue, compromise, and ecumania.

1 Cf. Second Vatican Council, Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium*, 23; Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Letter *Communio notio*, 12; 13. □

2 Cf. Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium*, 4; Decree *Unitatis reintegratio*, 2.

3 Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium*, 1. □

4 Decree *Unitatis reintegratio*, 1. □

5 Cf. Jn 17:20-21; Decree *Unitatis reintegratio*, 2. □

6 Cf. Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium*, 13. □

7 Cf. *ibid*; Acts 2:42.

8 Cf. Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium*, 8; Letter *Communio notio*, 4. □

9 Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium*, 8. □

10 Cf. CIC, can. 205; Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium*, 13; 14; 21; 22; Decree *Unitatis reintegratio*, 2; 3; 4; 15; 20; Decree *Christus Dominus*, 4; Decree *Ad gentes*, 22. □

11 Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium*, 8. □

12 Cf. John Paul II, Ap. Const. *Spirituali militum curae*, 21 April 1986, I § 1. □

13 Cf. CIC, cann. 1026-1032.

14 Cf. CIC, cann. 1040-1049. □

15 Cf. AAS 59 (1967) 674. □

16 Cf. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Statement of 1 April 1981, in *Enchiridion Vaticanum* 7, 1213. □

17 Cf. CIC, cann. 495-502. □ 18 Cf. CIC, cann. 492-494. □ 19 Cf. CIC, can. 511. □ □

[All Canon Laws from 1983 Code]

