

THE TWO CHURCHES

M. J. BAKER



**Analysis of the State of the Catholic
Church at the Opening of the
Second Quarter of the Twenty First
Century**

The Two Churches

Copyright © Michael John Baker 2026

Other than for quotations, cited with their accompanying references, the work and words are the author's alone.

Printed in Constantia font by Goulpress Printers

56 Auburn Street, Goulburn, NSW 2580 Australia

Phone 02 4821 1761 – email goulpress@ozemail.com.au

June 2026

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

Contents

Chapters

Introduction	②
1. For Love of the Church	1
2. Two Worm-ridden Popes	21
3. Paul VI of most infelicitous memory...	37
4. The Church of Paul VI & John Paul II	53
5. The Modernism of Benedict XVI	71
6. The Two Churches	81
7. The Catholic Dilemma & How to Solve It	97

Appendices

Pius V, <i>Quo primum</i> , July 14 th , 1570	14
Masons in the Vatican, December 1978	45

Cover image: Under the loom of the Church of Vatican II, Christ's Church, symbolised by the Dome of St Peter's, is struck by lightning on the evening of February 11th, 2013, the day on which Benedict XVI 'resigned' the papacy.

Introduction

This is the second edition. The seven papers that make up the book were written between October 2023 and May 2026 and published on superflumina.org. The order has been altered, each has been amended, footnotes adjusted.

It became clear that Pope Benedict XVI's resignation in 2013 was invalid. His putative successor, Jorge Bergoglio, died in April 2025 to be replaced by Robert Prevost as Leo XIV.

The first paper lays the ground for the book's thesis that, since 1965, and the conclusion of the pseudo-synod known as 'the Second Vatican Council', the Catholic Church has had to endure the company of another, and counterfeit, entity, *the Church of Vatican II*. Its proponents think this 'Church' identical with the Catholic Church as, regrettably, does a majority of the faithful.

The truth is that the two have been at war for sixty years: the treachery of Christ's ministers ensuring the dominance of the counterfeit. The confusion generated will only be resolved with the election of a Pope who recognises these realities, exposes the counterfeit for what it is, and condemns that pseudo-synod and its importunacy.

Michael Baker May 8th, 2026 - *Mary, Mediatrix of Graces*

FOR LOVE OF THE CHURCH

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

Hilaire Belloc¹

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

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

—were each of them susceptible of explanation, if not of ready solution. Papa Bergoglio died on April 21st, 2025. On May 8th following, the cardinals elected Robert Cardinal Prevost as his successor, Pope Leo XIV. The new Pope has endorsed the mentality of his predecessor and continued, and extended, his program.

Such is the fallibility of human nature—from which no tenant of papal or episcopal office is free—abuses of theological and liturgical principle are by no means unique

¹ *Letter to Dean Inge in Essays of a Catholic*, London, 1931

in the Catholic Church's history. But because the abuses of Papa Bergoglio derived from a different, and more vicious, tendency they bore a different character

Understanding the Issues

The key to understanding the issues at stake lies in acknowledging what the vast majority of Catholics, regrettably, decline to acknowledge, that the bishops of 'the Second Vatican Council', aided and abetted by Popes John XXIII and Paul VI, under the claim they were engaged in an ecumenical, or general, council of the Catholic Church, endorsed a raft of heterodox teachings which exposes that claim as false. The actions of those who gathered in the Vatican between 1962 and 1965 were not for the benefit of Christ's Church. 'Vatican II' was a modernist fraud.

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

Anyone prepared to weigh ‘the Second Vatican Council’ dispassionately should first read Pius VI’s introduction to *Auctorem Fidei* and, in particular, the following charge:

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

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

.....

“It is a most reprehensible technique for the insinuation of doctrinal errors and one condemned long ago by our predecessor St. Celestine [8] who found it used in the writings of Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, [a device] he exposed to condemn it with the greatest possible severity...”

These words might have been written specifically of those who promoted ‘the Second Vatican Council’.²

Since Christ promised that He would never abandon His Church, we can be certain that ‘the Council’s’ errors—errors which have been endorsed by every pope since 1965—will in due course be condemned as Pius VI condemned Pistoia. In the meantime, the faithful, who have suffered much from ‘the Council’s’ imposture, have more to suffer.

Among that synod’s more grievous consequences was the invention of an entity which has come to exist in parallel with the Catholic Church and choke her salvific work, a counterfeit, *the Church of Vatican II*. This ‘Church’, a secular entity, is bereft of God-given power. The bemusement that has afflicted the Catholic faithful since 1965 arises from the confusion of *this entity* with Christ’s Church. The effect of the confusion of the two is that Pope, cardinals and bishops now exercise an authority distinct from the authority given him by God, a merely human authority. The Pope, the cardinal, the bishop, may think as he acts, that he is doing so as prelate of the Catholic Church, when he is busy conducting himself as an officer of this un-Godly organisation.

It was inevitable that the *counterfeit* would come to involve itself in the crucial issue of the choice of pope.

² For a full copy of Pius VI’s Introduction to his encyclical see https://www.superflumina.org/PDF_files/auctorem-fidei-intro.pdf

This, it would seem, is what happened in March 2013 with the election of Jorge Mario Bergoglio. ‘Vatican II’s’ dysfunction dominated the considerations of the cardinal electors who ignored their obligations as bishops of the Catholic Church. Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò has reminded us of the submission of various of the Church’s prelates to the imposition of freemasonry whose long-established hatred of God is directed to taking control of His Church. There is much to be said for the archbishop’s argument that in Papa Bergoglio the masons achieved their end.

The archbishop might have quoted Leo XIII in his encyclical *Humanum Genus* (April 20th, 1884) n. 10:

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

Who would deny that the fruits of the Bergoglian pontificate were not most bitter for the faithful?

There was, however, another and more critical issue than the cardinals’ putative heterodoxy, which rendered their efforts nugatory. There was a defect in Benedict XVI’s resignation from the papal office.

Under Paul VI, Fr Josef Ratzinger had played a major part in dismantling *the Holy Office*, a central element of the Church’s executive arm, and in the humiliation of its

secretary, Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani. Fr Ratzinger preferred the philosophies of Georg Hegel and others to the philosophy Christ's Church had canonised. It mattered not that Pius XII had confirmed the dangers of such an attitude in *Humani Generis* (August 12th, 1950). Fr Ratzinger knew better! He was to be rewarded for his insouciance.

The body which John Paul II ordered to replace the *Holy Office*, the *Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith*, demonstrated, under the aegis of the, now Cardinal, Ratzinger, a singular ineptitude in grasp of Catholic theological and moral principle. Thus, it took its head more than a year to pronounce what any competent theologian could have proclaimed within twenty-four hours of its publication, that John Paul's teaching in *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis* was infallible. The *Congregation* showed itself incapable of offering a Catholic solution to the question of disposal of frozen human embryos—or even of acknowledging that a solution was possible! (It hardly needs to be said that John Paul II shared in this incompetence.) The claim that Ratzinger was a great theologian is nonsense.

His philosophical incompetence manifested itself in the mode of his resignation as Pope. He failed to grasp that, despite the irregularities incorporated in the 1983 iteration of the *Code of Canon Law*, the body of its laws continued to be grounded in the metaphysical principles St Thomas had expounded, and Pius XII had defended. Almighty God has so designed the natural order that every thing—every

substance, every accident, every action we perform— reflects a rigorous proportion between *natures, powers, acts and ends*. This order underpinned the provisions of the 1917 *Code*: it underpinned the provisions of its 1983 replacement, even as its draftsmen laboured to import the theological errors embraced by the ersatz Council into its structure.

In the text of his resignation, Papa Ratzinger said this:

“I am resigning the ministry (ministerium) of the Bishop of Rome, of the Successor of St Peter, entrusted to me through the hands of the cardinals...”³

But ‘the ministry’ is not the office! It is *the exercise of the powers of the office*. As Pope, and the first of the Catholic faithful, Benedict was bound to comply - indeed *bound to be foremost in complying* - with the requirements of the Church’s law. Canon 188 of the 1983 *Code* states clearly:

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

Since his resignation was more than merely uncertain in its expression, it contained substantial error, and canon 188 rendered it invalid. It follows that his resignation was ineffectual. Let the reader note carefully: *it does not matter what Pope Benedict intended; he failed to give his intention legal effect*. Accordingly, he remained Pope, ceding exercise of the powers to another ***for whose exercise and their consequences he remained***

³ Cf. *Seven Modernist Popes* at https://www.superflumina.org/PDF_files/seven-modernist-popes.pdf

responsible. That ‘other’ was, of course, Jorge Cardinal Bergoglio.

Thus, what the cardinals intended by electing Jorge Bergoglio is irrelevant. The papal office was not vacant and their efforts were, accordingly, nugatory. As an aside, the reader will appreciate the irony attaching to Benedict’s insistence that he should continue to be addressed as ‘Pope Emeritus’, for he was—*still*—Pope!

Another, and more dramatic, irony attended the ‘pontificate’ of his successor which we will leave for the reader’s further research.⁴

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

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

⁴ Dealt with in our study *Seven Modernist Popes* referred to in the previous footnote.

Once one understands the ambit of the papal power in the life of Church and Catholic faithful, the enormity of the papacy's subversion to the modernist imposition becomes apparent.

In his *motu proprio*, *Traditionis Custodes* (July 16th, 2021), 'Pope' Francis purported to impose restrictions on the celebration of Mass in the millennial Roman rite "to promote the concord and unity of the Church". He claimed that the liturgical books promulgated by Popes Paul VI and John Paul II "in conformity with the decrees of Vatican Council II are the unique expression of the *lex orandi* of the Roman Rite". But "the concord and unity of the Church" to which he referred were not those of the Church founded by Jesus Christ, the Catholic Church, but those of the modernist entity, *the Church of Vatican II*. This is patent in the way Paul VI contradicted the Catholic Church's teaching on the form of Mass in the Roman Rite canonised by Pope Pius V in the Bull *Quo primum* (July 14th, 1570) following the directions of the *Council of Trent*. This, the Catholic position, had been accepted by every pope for the 400 years that followed, until Paul VI. Little wonder that its terms were ignored by the faithful.

The *Society of St Pius X*, which recognised neither the bans imposed (first impliedly, then explicitly) by Paul VI, nor the qualified 'permissions' for its celebration, successively, of Paul VI, John Paul II and Benedict XVI, ignored *Traditionis Custodes*. Its members insisted, consistent with the directions of *Trent* and the Bull *Quo primum*, that

the manner of celebration of Mass is not a *matter of discipline* to be modified by this pope or that, but a *matter of faith* binding on all Catholics. They insist, consistent with *Trent* and *Quo primum*, any priest may celebrate Mass in that rite notwithstanding any direction to the contrary by pope, bishop or superior, as *Quo primum* states specifically!⁵

Other societies, such as the *Fraternity of St Peter*, whose existence is grounded in celebration of Mass in its millennial form, have obtained (as their principals think) more recent permissions to celebrate it. Archbishop Viganò has highlighted the precarious position in which these societies have placed themselves because of the concession demanded, as condition of such ‘permissions’, that they admit the spurious Council’s validity.⁶

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

⁵ See the Appendix to this paper.

⁶ A similar dilemma is faced by various orders of monks, canons and nuns, enclosed and non-enclosed.

There was much rumour in July 2024 that a papal document was imminent which would have 'banned' celebration of the millennial rite outright, and it is known that certain members of the Curia and of the episcopacy would have supported the endeavour. If the plan was shelved it was to prevent outright rebellion among the faithful. Its promoters were right to fear a reaction, but the wisdom that motivated them was not holy, but that of the children of this world who fear loss of their authority.

A Solution?

So, what is the solution for the Catholic faithful? In July 2017, some sixty-two priests, religious and laymen – including one bishop, Bishop Bernard Fellay of the *Society of St Pius X*, – endorsed a formal charge against 'Pope' Francis, entitled *Correctio Filialis*, which condemned certain views the Pope had expressed and called on him to repent of them. The pretender ignored it. On May 2nd, 2024, the Feast of St Athanasius, a much smaller group (seventeen in number) with but one priest, and lacking the support of Bishop Fellay, condemned 'Papa' Bergoglio for his teachings and behaviour and called on him to resign. They asserted, on grounds set forth *in extenso*, that he had committed criminal acts gravely damaging to the Church and to the faithful; that he had shown that he rejected the Catholic faith and had worked to destroy it. They urged the cardinals and bishops to ask him to resign and, should he refuse, that they declare that he has lost the papal office. Needless to say, these made no response.

Only one bishop was prepared to confront Bergoglio for his heterodoxy, Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò former apostolic nuncio to the United States of America. Now, of course, the issues that confronted the faithful over the behaviour of 'Pope' Francis, have disappeared.

Quis custodiet ipsos custodes, Juvenal's satiric remark, might be levelled at the episcopacy of the Catholic Church generally. The bishops are almost universally ineffectual. There are two causes of this, but the two reduce to one. The first is their celebration, daily, of a false rite of Holy Mass, Paul VI's *novus ordo*. That it is *illicit* is clear to anyone capable of understanding the words uttered by the *Council of Trent* and by Pius V in *Quo primum*. But it is also *schismatic*, since it proclaims a religion other than the Catholic religion.

The second cause is the confusion in which the bishops find themselves through their inability to distinguish the Catholic Church, which is of God, from her counterfeit the 'Church of Vatican II'. Their allegiance, as bishops, is to Christ and His Church, not to the modernist entity which usurps His authority and that of His Church.

One of the leading errors of 'Vatican II' was its commitment to the laity, in the face of Pius X's explicit condemnation of such a course in *Pascendi*, n. 27. The false 'Council's' bishops embraced this error, and a push

for democracy in the Church's structure, in their 'Pastoral Constitution', *Gaudium et Spes*.⁷

It is, then, a great irony that the chief source of opposition to 'Vatican II', to the popes who inspired it, and to those who promoted it, are members of the Catholic laity. These enjoy a particular immunity from sanction. While popes and their minions may have little hesitation in exercising their misdirected 'authority' over bishops, priests and religious for daring to disagree with their heterodox views, they are loathe to attempt the same with the lay faithful.

We, Christ's faithful people, must then persist in prayer and fasting, even as we persevere in criticising the Vatican for its dysfunction, which has worsened with each of the sixty years since the conclusion of the false Council.

More than a century ago Catholic poet Francis Thompson provided a profound insight into the Catholic Church, "the one *thing* in this world different from all others", when he gave the Church the unique title appearing in this stanza of his last poem—

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

⁷ The document was inspired by the founder of *Opus Dei*, Mons. Jose Maria Escrivá, who was fixated on the laity.

⁸ *The Kingdom of God*, op. posth., 1907

Appendix

BULL OF POPE PIUS V

QUO PRIMUM

July 14th, 1570

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9. It is Our will, therefore, and by the same authority, We decree that, after We publish this constitution and the edition of the Missal, the priests of the Roman Curia are,

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

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

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

validity everywhere and in every nation, as if Our manuscript were shown there.

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

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

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

TWO WORM-RIDDEN POPES

It is almost impossible to find a satisfactory report of what child visionaries, the shepherds Maximin Giraud and Mélanie Calvat were told when, on September 19th, 1846, they were attended by the Blessed Virgin at La Salette-Fallavaux in the Department of Isère in south eastern France. Allegations of censorship of their testimony abound. Two items have been mentioned as excised from the children's reports. The first is that Rome would lose the faith and become the seat of anti-Christ; the second, that there would appear in the century, or centuries, to come two worm-ridden popes – *deux papes vermoulus*.⁹

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

Rome Will Lose the Faith

There can be little doubt that the first of these prophecies has been fulfilled. One need only consider how the late 'Pope Francis' not only indulged in heterodoxy but allowed it to be broadcast that he no longer regarded himself as the Vicar of Christ, coupled with the effete-ness of the majority of his Curia who offered little opposition to his dissents from Catholic principle. His successor, Louis Prevost,

⁹ The reader will find the first of these repeated by Archbishop Viganò in his paper *I accuse Bergoglio of Heresy and Schism* available on the internet. The second is featured in a video and audiotape of the late Fr Gregory Hesse reproduced here <https://www.bitchute.com/video/OxIjJ5Z5UARn/>

Pope Leo XIV, has continued in the 'Franciscan' vein, praising his predecessor and his heterodox opinions.

It should not be thought that the state of affairs in which Christ's Church finds herself was precipitated by 'Pope Francis'. Jorge Bergoglio was but the end of a process that began with John XXIII, whose favouring of Marxism, of masonry and of modernism, opened the path for invasion of the sanctuary of God by the forces of the devil.

Angelo Roncalli's elevation to the papacy brought with it causes for concern. These causes were augmented when Giovanni Battista Cardinal Montini succeeded him. Paul VI's first encyclical *Ecclesiam Suam* went beyond mere dalliance with anti-Catholic principle. Its author embraced subjectivism, justifying his doing so by reference to 'the Council' then in progress.¹⁰ Far from intervening to correct its bishops over their problematic utterances, Paul VI encouraged them.

His successor Karol Wojtyla, formed in the defective philosophy of phenomenology, had been a major contributor to the ersatz Council, aiding the bishops' subjectivism and supporting their compromises of principle. It was appropriate that he should, as Pope, have adopted the name of his short-lived predecessor, for he was to continue the revolution John XXIII and Paul VI had begun.

¹⁰ See *The Church of Paul VI and of John Paul II* in Chapter 4.

Josef Cardinal Ratzinger, who succeeded John Paul II as Benedict XVI, had been one of 'the Council's' *periti*. He would have liked, as Pope, to moderate the effects of the revolution in which he had played a part, but his embrace of the modernist vision inhibited him. His 'resignation' from the papacy in February 2013 left the faithful to the care of the Archbishop of Buenos Aires, whose heterodox opinions were patent even before his election. It was inevitable, given the departures from principle in which the cardinals had engaged, that sooner or later they would elect a candidate totally unsuitable for the supreme office.

Rome *has* lost the faith. Jorge Bergoglio made it plain; Leo XIV, by his words and conduct, has confirmed it.

Emergence of the Counterfeit Church

The effect of 'the Council', as we remarked above, was its creation of *the Church of Vatican II*. Through this *counterfeit*, and its instruments, the succeeding popes, bishops and clergy, the devil has worked to convince the faithful that the direction of Christ's Church has changed, that the *counterfeit's* operations are her operations, that its teachings are her teachings, its administration her administration. In this struggle, *the Church of Vatican II* has, for the moment, the upper hand. While Pope Leo has the Power of the Keys, most of the time he conducts himself like a modernist heretic.

Yet despite their immersion in modernism, popes, cardinals, bishops and priests have not compromised the Catholic Church's integrity. Since she is of God, not man,

her direction, teaching and end are immutable. She is infallible and indefectible and, in due course, will throw off the incubus of her *counterfeit* and resume her wonted authority.

Deux Papes Vermoulus

As to the second prophecy, we ought first consider what Our Blessed Lady meant by ‘worm-ridden’? It is clear she spoke on analogy with an attack on the foundations of a wooden structure. There is one available! It is the *Barque of Peter*, which must navigate the world’s stormy seas until the end of time.

The inferences to be drawn from the prophecy are, surely, that the two popes Our Lady mentions, bound by their acceptance of the office inherited from St Peter, on whom the stability of the Church and security of the faith is founded, will fail to do so.

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

“has not been handed down as a philosophic invention to the human mind to be perfected, but... entrusted as a divine deposit... to be faithfully guarded and infallibly interpreted... [and that] that understanding of its sacred dogmas is to be perpetually retained which Holy Mother Church has once declared... there... never be[ing] recession from that meaning under the specious name of a deeper understanding...”¹¹

¹¹ Dogmatic Constitution *Dei Filius*, April 24th, 1870, Dz. 1800

Only among those associated with the alleged *Second* Vatican Council are there to be found popes who have sought to recede from the meaning of the Church's sacred dogmas. Among possible claimants to the title to this date – John XXIII, Paul VI, John Paul II, Benedict XVI, Francis and Leo XIV - we have settled on the two first, 1. because they are responsible for the incursion into the Church of the modernist heresy adopted by their successors, and 2. because, as we will see, each failed *in limine* to conform himself to the demands of fidelity to the Church's tradition in the exercise of the office.¹²

In the first edition of this book, we nominated Paul VI and Benedict XVI as the two who best fulfilled the necessary criteria. Late in 2025, however, there came to our attention the *Letter* written in the year 2000 by theologian, Fr Luigi Villa, associate of Padre Pio, to the Catholic episcopacy setting out a history of Angelo Roncalli who became successively, bishop, Patriarch of Venice, cardinal, and Pope John XXIII.¹³

The *Letter* revealed aspects of Roncalli's character and beliefs of which, it seems, leading commentators on the disaster of Vatican II were largely ignorant. If only a quarter of what Fr Villa alleges is true, long before his election to the Chair of Peter, Cardinal Roncalli had lost

¹² We set out in Chapter 6 the oath of St Agatho whose terms set out the demands of the papal office.

¹³ The author's rendition of the *Letter* into English from Italian is reproduced at https://www.superflumina.org/PDF_files/john-XXIII-beatified.pdf

any adequate understanding of Christ's Church as a divine thing, and had, in great measure, lost his Catholic faith.

John XXIII

In the year 2000, Pope John Paul II proposed John XXIII for beatification. In the same year, in one of his audio/videotapes, theologian and canon lawyer, the late Fr Gregory Hesse, remarked that Roncalli's disobedience while Patriarch of Venice to Pius XII's Decree of June 1949 condemning Communism and any involvement in its activities, rendered it impossible he could be a fit candidate for beatification.

Fr Villa went much further in his *Letter*. He explored Roncalli's accommodation with Communism and how he facilitated the concession to the Russian Communists which confirmed the dysfunction of 'the Second Vatican Council' and facilitated the invasion of the world with the Communist theories of antipathy in society which have done us so much harm.

Fr Villa explored Roncalli's involvement in other anti-Catholic activities; his friendship with Freemasons and indulgence towards Freemasonry in the face of the Church's condemnation of that deistic sect; his sympathy with Modernism and his active support for those, such as the Benedictine, Dom Lambert Beauduin who, ignoring the Church's prohibitions, conducted experiments with the Church's sacred liturgy. He exposed Angelo Roncalli as a friend of modernists like Ernesto Bonaiuti, defrocked and excommunicated head of the Italian modernists, and

his radically misplaced sympathy for Bonaiuti “as one who loved the Catholic Church”.

Theological principle seemed to have meant nothing to Roncalli. The Church’s insistence on the immense benefits to the world’s peoples that would flow from the Church’s involvement in the State’s activities (as Leo XIII had proclaimed in *Immortale Dei*, November 1st, 1885), which grounded Pius XI’s encyclical on the Social Reign of Our Blessed Lord, *Quas Primas* (6th December, 1925), was anathema to him. He supported the poisonous doctrine of separation of Church and State.

Paul VI

In his audio/video tapes, the late Fr Gregory Hesse published extensive criticisms of Paul VI whose content is ample to justify his nomination as the second of the two ‘worm-ridden’ popes. There is testimony of his dishonesty and duplicity while working for Pius XII. In addition, it is alleged he engaged in compromising behaviour whilst Archbishop of Milan which, it might rationally be concluded, placed him under masonic control. There is further evidence of this in his employment of Jean Cardinal Villot as his Secretary of State. Villot was later exposed as a mason.¹⁴

Paul VI’s attempt in his encyclical *Ecclesiam Suam* (August 6th, 1964) to reinvent Christ’s Church along subjectivist

¹⁴ See the list of Masons in the Vatican in the appendix to the next chapter.

lines found willing supporters among those of modernist inclination among 'the Council's' bishops. There was further scandal in his support for the self-contradictory document rejecting the Church's teaching against 'religious freedom', *Dignitatis Humanae*, the effect of which was to persuade one hundred and seventy-nine of 'the Council's' bishops to abandon their opposition to it, leaving a rump of only seventy.

Further evidence against Montini is found in his opposition to Archbishop Lefebvre's efforts to train priests dedicated to offering Mass in the millennial form of the Roman Rite. In 1974, under Villot's malign influence, he suppressed the archbishop's appeal to the Apostolic Signatura against tendentious findings levelled against him and his *Society of St Pius X*, so as to deny the archbishop a ruling in justice on the issues.

During a Consistory on May 24th 1976, Papa Montini reproached the archbishop publicly for refusing *today's* authority in the name of *yesterday's* (as if the Church's authority varied with time), for "leading people into disobedience on the pretext of keeping the faith intact", and for refusing 'the new mass' because of a "sentimental attachment" to the old. "This [the establishment of the *novus ordo missae*]," he claimed, "is nothing less than what our predecessor Pius V did when, after the Council of Trent, he made obligatory the missal that was reformed under his authority".

The misrepresentations here are testament to Paul VI's duplicity. First, Pius V *did not* reform the Roman missal. With the authority of *Trent*, he canonised—that is *codified*—the mode in which Mass had been offered for a thousand years (*Quo Primum*, July 15th, 1570). Secondly, when Paul VI instituted *his* rite, he did the very opposite of what Pius V had done: he introduced novelty. He breached, moreover, the Church's explicit *monitum against doing so*, incurring thereby the anathema imposed by *Trent* and a second one invoked by Pius V on anyone who would seek to alter the form in which Mass is to be offered in the Roman rite. In the third place, his assertion that Archbishop Lefebvre's refusal of the 'new Mass' was for sentimental reasons was false.

Archbishop Lefebvre had tried on a number of occasions to see the Pope but had been rebuffed by Cardinal Villot. It is worth reading the account of the interchange which occurred when, at last, on September 11th, 1976 the Pope granted the archbishop an audience. This is the report reproduced in the biography of the archbishop by Bishop Bernard Tissier de Mallerais.¹⁵

†

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

¹⁵ Taken from the Archbishop's recollections with an interpolation from Peter Hebblethwaite's book on Paul VI. Cf. *The Biography Marcel Lefebvre*, op. cit., pp. 491-2.

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

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

'You condemn me,' Paul VI began nervously, 'I am a modernist, a Protestant. It's intolerable! You are doing wicked work.' The Archbishop said he sensed that the Holy Father felt personally attacked.

'So then,' Paul VI finished up saying, 'now. Talk.'

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

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

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

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

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

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

‘There were two that I did not sign.’

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

...

‘And why not religious liberty?’

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

‘Let’s leave that aside! We are not here to discuss theology.’ (I thought to myself, this is unbelievable.) ‘You have no right to oppose the Council; you are a scandal for the Church; you destroy the Church. It is horrible, you raise up Christians against the Pope and against the Council. Do you feel nothing in your conscience that condemns you?’

‘Nothing at all.’

‘You are irresponsible.’

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

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

‘I do what?’

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

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

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

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

‘Very well. I’ll think about it, pray, and consult with the Congregation of the Consistory and the Curia. These are difficult problems. I will write to you. Let us pray together.’ We prayed a *Pater Noster*, *Veni Sancte Spiritus* and *Ave Maria*. He led to the adjoining room, walking with difficulty.

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

†

Paul VI rejected the archbishop’s plea formally on October 11th, invoking in his support the false understanding of tradition the bishops of ‘Vatican II’ had enunciated in *Dei Verbum* n. 8.¹⁶

The Pope’s refusal to uphold his own moral teaching in *Humanae Vitae* in the celebrated *Washington Case* is further evidence of his duplicity.¹⁷

¹⁶ Cf. Chapter 3 below.

¹⁷ Reported in George Weigel, *The Courage to be Catholic*, New York, 2002, pp. 68 et seq.

Consolation for the Catholic Faithful?

Given the experience of some 175 years of the Catholic Church's sufferings at the hands of heretics and schismatics since Our Blessed Lady's appearance at La Salette, her prophecies, if correctly reported, may offer the Catholic faithful some hope for the future. If, as she is said to have prophesied, the anti-Christ is already seated on the throne of Peter, and the two 'worm-ridden' popes have already appeared, we may hope that the time is not too far distant when a pope will appear who will be a Catholic, one who will labour to restore the Catholic Church to her rightful position as mistress in her own house.

At the very least this will require acknowledgement that the *Church of Vatican II* is not identical with the Church Christ founded, as well as condemnation of that pseudo-synod for its imposture and condemnation of its innumerable promoters.

The groundwork for this return to sanity has already been laid by the widespread opposition to that 'Council' and the mindset of Popes Paul VI and John Paul II, by the late Archbishop Lefebvre, carried on by the Society he founded and the religious and faithful associated with its work. It is as a result of the archbishop's much-criticised initiative in 1988 of consecrating, with Bishop Antonio de Castro Mayer, bishops to ensure the ordination of priests to celebrate Mass in the millennial Roman rite, that has enabled the *Society of St Pius X* to grow as it has. It will be augmented by the *Society's* initiative of consecrating, on

the Feast of the Precious Blood, July 1st, 2026, four additional bishops to the same end, of ordaining priests who will be free of the incubus of the modernist 'Council'.

We should not neglect to note that there was another great benefit which flowed from the archbishop's action. It precipitated a reaction within *the Church of Vatican II* which enabled establishment of the *Priestly Society of St Peter* and other associations of priests dedicated to offering Mass in the millennial rite. While it is regrettable that these look for their authority to an incompetent source, the error-riddled Apostolic Letter of Pope John Paul II, *Ecclesia Dei* (July 2nd, 1988), that they are able to celebrate Holy Mass in its proper form is a great good.¹⁸

We have set forth elsewhere the shortcomings of Josef Cardinal Ratzinger, Pope Benedict XVI, the only 'conservative' among the seven modernist popes since the death of Pius XII. His conservatism moved him to try to accommodate the demands that flowed from the ersatz Council with traditional Catholic feeling. He did this with his apostolic letter *Summorum Pontificum* (July 7th, 2007). There he denominated the *novus ordo* the *forma ordinaria* of the Roman Missal, and the traditional (or millennial) rite its *forma extraordinaria*.

¹⁸ On the shortcomings of the apostolic letter *Ecclesia Dei* see *The Status of the Novus Ordo Missae* at https://www.superflumina.org/PDF_files/status-novus-ordo.pdf

His proposal involved a number of errors. The first was its endorsement of Paul VI's error of ignoring the distinction between matters of faith and matters of discipline. Papa Ratzinger involvement in modern philosophy meant he shared in its signal characteristic of neglect of essential distinctions.¹⁹ It mattered not to Montini (or to Ratzinger) that the popes of the 400 years following *Quo primum*, had treated the content of the bull as irreformable.

Papa Ratzinger's second error followed on the first. There are not two rites in which Mass may be offered, there is one only. Condidgny, there are not *two* Roman Missals: there is only *one*, Pius V's Missal of 1570, brought up to date with minor alterations. His third error was the assertion that the "new Missal" was an expression of the Missal promulgated by Pius V. It was not. Pius V spoke clearly in *Quo primum*, as anyone could see who bothered to study its terms. The *Council of Trent* spoke equally clearly in canon 13 of its Seventh Session!

While Pope Benedict's initiative may have been seen by many Catholics as a step in the right direction, he did not act to restore the Catholic liturgy, but to effect a compromise with the modernist imposition. He took another step in the same direction on January 21st, 2009, when he lifted the excommunications purportedly imposed by John Paul II (on July 2nd, 1988) of the bishops involved in the consecrations at Ecône, Switzerland, two

¹⁹ This follows on modern philosophy's rejection of the formal cause in things and actions, a corollary of materialism.

days prior. His behaviour places him in the category Pius X identifies in *Pascendi* n. 27, of 'conservative modernist'.

For Pope Benedict's shortcomings these actions had the happy effect of reducing the opposition which had simmered among the faithful, ignorant as to the necessity which had driven the archbishop and Bishop de Castro Mayer to act.

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

PAUL VI OF MOST INFELICITOUS MEMORY...

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

Pope Paul VI²⁰

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

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

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

²⁰ Address of November 26, 1969

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

“[His] most significant weakness was in his judgment of subordinates, displayed disastrously in the matter of the Vatican finances. Central to this was his appointment of Cardinal Jean Villot as secretary of state... An aloof and secretive figure, Villot was the typical *énarque*, promoting the mission of an enlightened elite to dispense progress to the multitude... Paul VI raised him to the cardinalate in 1965, brought him to the Curia two years later, and in May 1969, appointed him secretary of state... Villot remained in office until his death in 1979. He benefited from a measure taken... in direct contrast to the professed aim of de-politicising the Church, whereby the secretary of state was given general authority over all the departments of the Curia, thus introducing a secularisation of the government of the Church under which it has laboured ever since.”²¹

A few pages later Sire goes on:

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

²¹ H J A Sire, *Phoenix from the Ashes, The Making, Unmaking and Restoration of Catholic Tradition*, Kettering OH (Angelico Press), 2015, pp. 365, 6

the world was looking for a Church without authority, a pope without authority seemed the appropriate model... In the short term... Paul VI escapes a realistic estimate, but the idols of the present age will not last forever, either in the world or in the Church. When they have passed, he will be judged in the light of the anarchy that he promoted in the Church, the reflection of his own division of mind..."²²

Sire concludes with the verdict that the reign of Paul VI deserves to be denominated the most disastrous pontificate in the Catholic Church's history.²³

In his acerbic commentary on the reign of Paul VI the late Fr Gregory Hesse uttered the comment which we have used as title of this article.²⁴ Elsewhere he compared him to his disadvantage with the notorious Borgia pope: "Better an Alexander VI," he said, "than Paul VI!"

Reports of the less than honest behaviour of Fr. Giovanni-Batista Montini, the priest who became bishop, cardinal and finally pope are rife. Sire mentions that Pius XII, even as he valued his services, yet suspected Msgr Montini.²⁵ Pius XII had prohibited his Vatican staff from dealing with the Russians. The Lutheran bishop of Upsala (Sweden), Yngue Torgny Brilioth, informed Pius XII via an emissary

²² *Phoenix from the Ashes*, op. cit., p. 372

²³ *Ibid.* p. 363

²⁴ Audio tape n. 15, *Sacred Mass according to Church Law*, at about the 12th minute: cf.

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

²⁵ *Phoenix from the Ashes*, op. cit., p. 193

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

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

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

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

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

Apprised of Gremigni's sudden death, Montini sought to recover the letter and called on Gremigni's young auxiliary, Ugo Poletti, an hour after midnight. Bishop Poletti made excuses but the archbishop was not to be denied. Some hours went by, however, before Poletti handed him the letter. The young bishop had apparently taken a copy and his progression through the ranks of the episcopacy to become progressively Archbishop of Spoleto and, in 1973, Cardinal is assessed as flowing from the hold he enjoyed over the Pope. The source of this story is an anonymously authored book entitled *Shroud of Secrecy, the Story of Corruption within the Vatican*, published in Italian in 1999.²⁶ While one may be concerned over the reliability of what is told, it demonstrates how blackmail may have been used to constrain Paul VI's actions, particularly when one considers events that followed.²⁷

When Paul VI died in August 1978 the assembled cardinals elected as pope the Patriarch of Venice, Albino Luciano,

²⁶ Toronto, Canada, 1999, pp.137-8; being a translation into English of *Via col vento in Vaticano*, Milano, 1999. The authors called themselves 'The Millenari'.

²⁷ Sire adverts to it on p. 368 of his text.

who chose the names 'John Paul'. A disaffected mason, Italian journalist Carmine Pecorelli, approached the new Pope precipitately and provided him with a list of the names of more than one hundred bishops, priests, religious and laity he alleged were members of the masonic sect, as evidence of its infiltration of the Curia and the Church's higher ranks.²⁸ The list included the names of Cardinals Villot, Casaroli, Suenens and Baggio, and Ugo Cardinal Poletti. The question for consideration is why Pecorelli should have chosen to make his revelations not to Paul VI but to his successor. A gruesome event lends circumstantial support to the veracity of the list of names provided. Pecorelli was assassinated on a Rome street a few weeks later.

Many will take the view that the most appalling action of Paul VI's pontificate was his betrayal, through the mediacy of Cardinal Casaroli, of Cardinal Mindszenty²⁹ which the Pope compounded by failing to provide a representative at his burial. But that 'honour' belongs to his sycophantic address to the General Assembly of the United Nations on October 5th, 1965. There the Pope abandoned the Church's constant teaching against 'religious liberty' *two months prior to* the Council's declaration in support, and submitted the Church of Christ and her dignity to the demands of the secular world. Could there be a better indicator that Paul VI was under masonic control?

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

²⁸ A reproduction of the list is set out in the appendix to this Chapter.

²⁹ Sire, *op. cit.* p. 379

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

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

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

“No one whosoever he be (*nulli omnino hominum*) is permitted to infringe or rashly contravene this notice of Our permission... nor is he allowed to act against it temerarily.

But should anyone presume to attempt to do so, let him know that he will incur the wrath of Almighty God and of Saints Peter and Paul, His Apostles.”

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

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

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

Appendix

LIST OF MASONS IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

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

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

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

- John Paul II from 1989 to 1992. 8-14-57; # 85-1640. Masonic code name "SEBA". Controlled consecration of Bishops.
- Dante Balboni. Assistant to the Vatican Pontifical. Commission for Biblical Studies. 7-23-68; # 79-14 "BALDA."
 - Salvatore Baldassarri. Bishop of Ravenna, Italy. 2-19-58; # 4315-19. "BALSA."
 - Ernesto Balducci. Religious sculpture artist. 5-16-66; # 1452-3.
 - Ernesto Basadonna. Prelate of Milan, 9-14-63; # 9-243. "BASE."
 - Guilio Batelli. Lay member of many scientific academies. 8-24-59; # 29-A. "GIBA."
 - Lorenzo Bedeschi. 2-19-59; # 24-041. "BELO."
 - Luigi Belloli. Rector of Seminary, Lombardy. 4-6-58; # 22-04. "BELLU."
 - Cleto Belluchi. Coadjutor to Bishop of Fermo, Italy. 6-4-68; # 12-217.
 - Luigi Bettazzi. Bishop of Ivera, Italy. 5-11-66; # 1347-45. "LUBE."
 - Giovanni Bianchi. 10-23-69; # 2215-11. "BIGI."
 - Franco Biffi. Msgr, Rector and Head of St. John Lateran Pontifical University. Controlled what is being taught. Confessor of Pope Paul VI. 8-15-59. "BIFRA."
 - Mario Bicarella. Prelate of Vicenza, Italy. 9-23-64; # 21-014. "BIMA."
 - Gaetano Bonicelli. Bishop of Albano, Italy. 5-12-59; # 63-1428, "BOGA."
 - Giancarlo Boretti. 3-21-65; # 0-241. "BORGI."
 - Alberto Bovone. Substitute Secretary of the Sacred Office. 3-30-67; # 254-3. "ALBO."
 - Mario Brini. Archbishop. Secretary of Chinese, Oriental, and Pagans. Member of Pontifical Commission to Russia. Controlled rewriting of Canon Law. 7-7-68; # 15670. "MABRI."

- Annibale Bugnini. Archbishop. Author of *Novus Ordo*. Envoy to Iran, 4-23-63; # 1365-75. "BUAN."
- Michele Buro. Bishop. Prelate of Pontifical Commission to Latin America, 3-21-69; # 140-2. "BUMI."
- Agostino Cacciavillan. Secretariat of State. 11-6-60; # 13-154.
- Umberto Cameli. Director in Office of the Ecclesiastical Affairs of Italy in regard to education in Catholic doctrine. 11-17-60; # 9-1436.
- Giovanni Caprile. Director of Catholic Civil Affairs. 9-5-57; # 21-014. "GICA."
- Giuseppe Caputo. 11-15-71; # 6125-63. "GICAP."
- Agostino Casaroli. Cardinal. Secretary of State under John Paul II from July 1, 1979 until he retired in 1989. 9-28-57; # 41-076. "CASA."
- Flaminio Cerruti. Chief of the Office of the University of Congregation Studies. 4-2-60; # 76-2154. "CEFLA."
- Mario Ciarrocchi. Bishop. 8-23-62; # 123-A. "CIMA."
- Enrico Chiavacci. Professor of Moral Theology, University of Florence, Italy. 7-2-70; # 121-34. "CHIE."
- Carmelo Conte. 9-16-67; # 43-096. "CONCA."
- Alessandro Csele. 3-25-60; # 1354-09. "ALCSE."
- Luigi Dadagio. Papal Nuncio to Spain. Archbishop of Lero. 9-8-67. # 43-B. "LUDA."
- Enzo D'Antonio. Archbishop of Trivento. 6-21-69; # 214-53.
- Donat De Bous. Bishop. 6-24-68; # 321-02. "DEBO."
- Luigi Del Gallo Reoccagiovane. Bishop. Apostolic Delegate of the Pontifical Council for the Laity.
- Aldo Del Monte. Bishop of Novara, Italy. 8-25-69; # 32-012. "ADELMO."
- Danielle Faltin. 6-4-70; # 9-1207. "FADA."
- Giuseppe Ferraioli. Member of Sacred Congregation for Public Affairs. 11-24-69; # 004-125. "GIFE."

- Giovanni Franzoni. 3-2-65; # 2246-47. "FRAGI."
- Vito Gemmiti. Sacred Congregation of Bishops. 3-25-68; # 54-13. "VIGE."
- Giulio Girardi. 9-8-70; # 1471-52. "GIG."
- Angelinin Fiorenzo. Bishop. Title of Commendator of the Holy Spirit. Vicar General of Roman Hospitals. Controlled hospital trust funds. Consecrated Bishop 7-19-56; joined Masons 10-14-57.
- Massimo Giustetti. 4-12-70; # 13-065. "GIUMA."
- Alessandro Gottardi. Procurator and Postulator General of Fratelli Maristi. Archbishop of Trent. 6-13-59; # 2437-14. "ALGO."
- Mario Gozzini. 5-14-70; # 31-11. "MAGO."
- Carlo Grazinai. Rector of the Vatican Minor Seminary. 7-23-61; # 156-3. "GRACA."
- Antonio Gregagnin. Tribune of First Causes for Beatification. 10-19-67; # 8-45. "GREA."
- Franco Gualdrini. Rector of Capranica. 5-22-61; # 21-352. "GUFRA."
- Annibale Ilari. Abbot. 3-16-69; # 43-86. "ILA."
- Pio Laghi. Nunzio Apostolic Delegate to Argentina, and then U.S.A. until 1995. 8-24-69; # 0-538. "LAPI."
- Giovanni Lajolo. Member of Council of Public Affairs of the Church. 7-27-70; # 21-1397. "LAGI."
- Angelo Lanzoni. Chief of the Office of Secretary of State. 9-24-56; # 6-324. "LANA."
- Virgilio Levi (alias Levine), Monsignor. Assistant Director of Official Vatican Newspaper, *L'Osservatore Romano*. Managed Vatican Radio Station. 7-4-58; # 241-3. "VILE."
- Lino Lozza. Chancellor of Rome Academy of St. Thomas Aquinas of Catholic Religion. 7-23-69; # 12-768. "LOLI."
- Achille Lienart. Cardinal. Grand Master Mason. Bishop of Lille, France. Recruited Masons. Leader of the progressive forces at Vatican II.

- Pasquale Macchi. Cardinal. Pope Paul's Prelate of Honour and Private Secretary until excommunicated for heresy by Pope Paul VI. Reinstated by Secretary of State, Jean Villot, and made a Cardinal. 4-23-58; # 5463-2. "MAPA."
- Italo Mancini. Director of Sua Santita. 3-18-68; # 1551-142. "MANI."
- Enrico Manfrini. Lay Consultor of Pontifical Commission of Sacred Art. 2-21-68; # 968-c. "MANE."
- Francesco Marchisano. Prelate Honour of the Pope. Secretary Congregation for Seminaries and Universities of Studies. 2-4-61; 4536-3. "FRAMA."
- Paul Marcinkus. American bodyguard. Cicero, Illinois. Stood 6'4". President for Institute for Training Religious. 8-21-67; # 43-649. Called "GORILLA." Code name "MARPA."
- Salvatore Marsili. Abbot of Order of St. Benedict of Finalpia near Modena, Italy. 7-2-63; # 1278-49. "SALMA."
- Antonio Mazza. Titular Bishop of Velia. Secretary General of Holy Year, 1975. 4-14-71. # 054-329. "MANU."
- Venerio Mazzi. Member of Council of Public Affairs of the Church. 10-13-66; # 052-s. "MAVE."
- Pier Luigi Mazzoni. Congregation of Bishops. 9-14-59; # 59-2. "PILUM."
- Luigi Maverna. Bishop of Chiavari, Genoa, Italy. Assistant General of Italian Catholic Azione. 6-3-68; # 441-c. "LUMA."
- Albino Mensa. Archbishop of Vercelli, Piedmont, Italy. 7-23-59; # 53-23. "MENA."
- Carlo Messina. 3-21-70; # 21-045. "MECA."
- Zanon Messina (Adele). 9-25-68; # 045-329. "AMEZ."
- Dino Monduzzi. Regent to the Prefect of the Pontifical House. 3-11 -67; # 190-2. "MONDI."

- Daimazio Mongillo. Professor of Dominican Moral Theology, Holy Angels Institute of Roma. 2-16-69; # 2145-22. "MONDA."
- Marcello Morgante. Bishop of Ascoli Piceno in East Italy. 7-22-55; # 78-3601. "MORMA."
- Teuzo Natalini. Vice President of the Archives of Secretariat of the Vatican. 6-17-67; # 21-44d. "NATE."
- Carmelo Nigro. Rector of the Seminary, Pontifical of Major Studies. 12-21-70; # 23-154. "CARNI."
- Virgillio Noe. Head of the Sacred Congregation of Divine Worship. 4-3-61; # 43652-21. "VINO."
- Vittorie Palestra. Legal Counsel of the Sacred Rota of the Vatican State. 5-6-43; # 1965. "PAVI."
- Salvatore Pappalardo. Cardinal. Archbishop of Palermo, Sicily. 4-15-68; # 234-07. "SALPA."
- Gottardo Pasqualetti. 6-15-60; # 4-231. "COPA."
- Dante Pasquinelli. Council of Nunzio of Madrid. 1-12-69; # 32-124. "PADA."
- Michele Pellegrino. Cardinal. Called "Protector of the Church", Archbishop of Torino (Turin). 5-2-60; # 352-36. "PALMI."
- Giannino Piana. 9-2-70; # 314-52. "GIPI."
- Mario Pimpo. Vicar of Office of General Affairs. 3-15-70; # 793-43. "PIMA."
- Pio Vito Pinto. Msgr. Attaché of Secretary of State and Notare of Second Section of Supreme Tribunal and of Apostolic Signature. 4-2-70; # 3317-42. "PIPIVI."
- Ugo Poletti. Cardinal. Vicar of S.S. Diocese of Rome. Controlled clergy of Rome from 3-6-73. Member of Sacred Congregation of Sacraments and of Divine Worship. President of Pontifical Works and Preservation of the Faith. President of the Liturgical Academy. 2-17-69; # 32-1425. "UPO."

- Mario Rizzi. Msgr. Sacred Congregation of Oriental Rites. Listed as "Prelate Bishop of Honour of the Holy Father, the Pope." Worked under Mario Brini to manipulate Canon Law. 9-16-69; # 43-179. "MARI", "MONMARI".
- Florenzo Romita. Sacred Congregation of Clergy. 4-21-56; # 52-142. "FIRO."
- Igine Rogger. Officer in S.S. (Diocese of Rome). 4-16-68; # 319-13. "IGRO."
- Pietro Rossano. Sacred Congregation of Non-Christian Religions. 2-12-68; # 3421-a. "PIRO."
- Virgillio Rovela. 6-12-64; # 32-14. "ROVI."
- Aurelio Sabbatani. Archbishop of Giustiniana (Giusgno, Milar Province, Italy). First Secretary Supreme Apostolic Signatura. 6-22-69; # 87-43. "ASA"
- Guilio Sacchetti. Delegate of Governors - Marchese. 8-23-59; # 0991-b. "SAGI."
- Francesco Salerno. Bishop. 5-4-62; # 0437-1. "SAFRA"
- Francesco Santangelo. Substitute General of Defence Legal Counsel. 11-12-70; # 32-096. "FRASA."
- Pietro Santini. Vice Official of the Vicar. 8-23-64; # 326-11. "SAPI."
- Ferdnando Savorelli. 1-14-69; # 004-51. "SAFE."
- Renzo Savorelli. 6-12-65; # 34-692. "RESA."
- Gaetano Scanagatta. Sacred Congregation of the Clergy. Member of Commission of Pomei and Loreto, Italy. 9-23-71; # 42-023. "GASCA."
- Giovanni Schasching. 3-18-65; # 6374-23. "GISCHA," "GESUITA."
- Mario Schierano. Titular Bishop of Acrida (Acri in Cosenza Province, Italy.) Chief Military Chaplain of the Italian Armed Forces. 7-3-59; #14-3641. "MASCHI."
- Domenico Semproni. Tribunal of the Vicarate of the Vatican. 4-16-60; # 00-12. "DOSE."

- Sensi, Giuseppe Mario. Titular Archbishop of Sardi (Asia Minor near Smyrna). Papal Nunzio to Portugal. 11-2-67; # 18911-47. "GIMASE."
- Luigi Sposito. Pontifical Commission for the Archives of the Church in Italy. Head Administrator of the Apostolic Seat of the Vatican.
- Leo Suenens. Cardinal. Protector of the Church of St. Peter in Chains, outside Rome. Promoted Protestant Pentecostalism (Charismatics). Endeavoured to change much Church dogma when he worked in three different Congregations: 1) Propagation of the Faith; 2) Rites and Ceremonies in the Liturgy; 3) Seminaries. 6-15-67; # 21-64. "LESU."
- Dino Tralbalzini. Bishop of Rieti (Reate, Perugia, Italy). Auxiliary Bishop of Southern Rome. 2-6-65; # 61-956. "TRADI."
- Antonio Travia. Titular Archbishop of Termini Imerese. Head of Catholic schools. 9-15-67; # 16-141. "ATRA."
- Vittorio Trocchi. Secretary for Catholic Laity in Consistory of the Vatican State Consultations. 7-12-62; # 3-896. "TROVI."
- Roberto Tucci. Director General of Vatican Radio. 6-21-57; # 42-58. "TURO."
- David Tuoldo. 6-9-67; # 191-44. "DATU."
- Georgio Vale. Priest. Official of Rome Diocese. 2-21-71; # 21-328. "VAGI."
- Piero Vergari. Head Protocol Officer of the Vatican Office Signatura. 12-14-70; # 3241-6. "PIVE."
- Jean Villot. Cardinal. Secretary of State to Paul VI. Camerlengo (Treasurer). "JEANNI", "ZURIGO."
- Lino Zanini. Titular Archbishop of Adrianopoli (Andrianopolis, Turkey). Apostolic Nuncio. Member of the Revered Fabric of St. Peter's Basilica.

THE CHURCH OF PAUL VI AND OF JOHN PAUL II

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

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

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

will. To make it clear: the Church is the mother of all men *only in potency*.³⁰

This failure indicated a lapse from the sanity of the Church's philosophy and from the common-sense demand to acknowledge distinctions. As late as August, 1950, Pius XII had insisted that the Church's theology is grounded in the realism of St Thomas, and condemned excursions into modern philosophy.³¹

Papa Montini's lapse was typical of one who favoured modern philosophy's facile postulates. Another of modern philosophy's flaws is subjectivism, according to which truth is determined not by reality but by opinion. This solecism appears in other of the encyclical's provisions. In n. 9 we read, "this is the hour in which the Church should deepen its consciousness of itself", an essay into the subjective which the Pope claimed (in n. 7) was called for by the deliberations of the currently running 'Second Vatican Council'.

In n. 6 the Pope demonstrated theological incompetence when he said:

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

In the first place, this utterance is, in theological terms, *mala sonans*—offensive to pious ears—because it runs

³⁰ This error of Paul VI was to be repeated in faulty translations of the words of consecration in the *novus ordo missae*.

³¹ Pius XII, *Humani Generis*, August 12th, 1950, nn. 29-34

counter to the clear expression of the *Vatican Council* in the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Pastor Aeternus*, July 18th, 1870, that—

“[t]he Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter that by His revelation they might disclose new doctrine, but that by his help they might sacredly safeguard and faithfully expound the revelation transmitted through the apostles as well as the deposit of faith.” Dz. 1836³²

If it is beyond the power of a pope to express ideas (*sc.* doctrines) that are new, *a fortiori* is it beyond the power of an ecumenical council.

Additionally, the statement savoured of *Conciliarism* whose thesis it is that the Pope is subject to the bishops.³³ These failures raise the question of just what ‘Church’ it was that Paul VI had in mind when he penned the opening words which gave the encyclical its eponymous title.

‘The Second Vatican Council’

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

³² *Neque enim Petri successoribus Spiritus Sanctus promissus est, ut eo revelante novam doctrinam patefacerent, sed ut eo assistente traditam per Apostolos revelationem seu fidei depositum sancte custodirent et fideliter exponerent.*

³³ *Vatican Council*, Dogmatic Constitution concerning the Catholic Faith, *Dei Filius*, April 24, 1870, ‘If anyone says that the Roman Pontiff... possesses not the whole plenitude of [the] supreme power... or that this power is not ordinary and immediate... let him be anathema. Dz. 1831

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

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

The Catholic Church is neither ‘a kind of sacrament’ nor ‘a sign of the unity of mankind’. She is not at the service of men. Rather, men, if they are to come to their proper end, must embrace her. This claim reiterated Paul VI's thesis in *Ecclesiam Suam* that the Church was founded to be ‘the mother of all men’. It attempted to change her nature.

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

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

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

In n. 15 of *Ecclesiam Suam*, in a further subjectivist foray, the bishops spoke as if a Protestant faith (and there are innumerable varieties) differs from the Catholic faith only in degree rather than in kind,³⁴ and as if Catholics and adherents of the Protestant, or other heretical, sects have something in common.³⁵ In n. 16 they went even further, asserting that the plan of salvation included “in the first place... the Moslems (who) profess to hold the faith of Abraham and adore together with us... the one merciful God...” Whatever ‘God’ this sect adores, its members reject the divinely inspired Old and New Testaments and condemn the revelation, confirmed by the Church, of the Trinity of Divine Persons in One God. The Moslems’ ‘God’ is, moreover, far removed from the One Who created mankind in love. St Thomas remarked with justice:

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

³⁴ “The Church knows that she is joined in many ways to the baptized who are honoured by the name of Christian but who do not however profess the Catholic faith in its entirety or have not preserved unity or communion under the successor of Peter...” Those who deny any element of the Catholic faith are heretics. Their ‘faith’ is not divine (of God), but human only. *Summa Theologiae* II-II, q. 5, a. 3; q. 11, a. 1

³⁵ “There is... a sharing in prayer and spiritual benefits; these Christians are indeed in some way joined to us in the Holy Spirit for by his gifts and graces his sanctifying power is active in them also and he has strengthened some of them even to the shedding of their blood.” The proposition “that Protestantism is only a different form of the same Christian religion”, was condemned by Pius IX, *Syllabus of Errors*, December 8th, 1864, n. 18. That there can be no martyrdom outside the Catholic Church and the Catholic faith is attested to by St Cyprian *The Unity of the Catholic Church* 14; *Letter to Jubaianus*, 72, 73, and in the writings of St Irenaeus and St Augustine.

sent in the power of his arms, signs which are not lacking even to robbers and tyrants...”³⁶

They said in n. 3 of their ‘Decree on Ecumenism’, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, published on the same date, the following:

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

This is blatantly heretical. The Church’s teaching on the unity of the Church is set forth *in extenso* in the encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, *Satis Cognitum* (June 29th, 1896), whose burden is reflected in a passage from St Cyprian:

“St. Paul says: ‘All members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body, so also is Christ’ (I Cor. xii, 12). Wherefore this mystical body, he declares, is ‘compact and fitly jointed together. The head, Christ: from whom the whole body, being compacted and fitly jointed together, by what every joint supplies according to the operation in the measure of every part’ (*Eph.* iv, 15-16). And so dispersed members, separated one from the other, cannot be united with one and the same head. *There is one God, and one Christ; and His Church is one and the faith is one; and one the people, joined together in the solid unity of the body in the bond of concord. This unity cannot be broken, nor the one body divided by the separation of its constituent parts* (*De Cath. Eccl. Unitate*, n. 23) ... What similarity is there between a dead and a living body?”

³⁶ *Summa Contra Gentiles* Bk. I, ch. vi. n. 4

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

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

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

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

This is an attempt to reinterpret the Church's constant teaching along modernist lines. It effectively denies the Church's teaching that, because she is of God and not of man, the Church is possessed of the fulness of divine truth. The statement makes a mockery, moreover, of the teaching of the *Council of Trent* in 1546 and the *Vatican Council* in 1870, defining the Church's tradition.³⁷

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

It is impossible, therefore, that Paul VI's *Ecclesiam Suam* and the documents of 'the Second Vatican Council', *Lumen Gentium*, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, and *Dei Verbum*, could be documents of the Catholic Church; impossible that that synod of bishops could have been a general, or ecumenical, council of the Catholic Church.

If anyone is in doubt as to this analysis or of Paul VI's intent, manifest in his actions, it will pay him to study the Pope's

³⁷ *Trent*, Session IV, April 8th, 1546, Dz. 783; *Vatican*, Session III, *Dogmatic Constitution Dei Filius*, Ch. 2 *Revelation*, April 24th, 1870, Dz. 1787 & Ch. 4, *Faith & Reason*, Dz. 1800

Address to the United Nations General Assembly on October 4th, 1965. His abandonment of the authority of Christ and of His Church over the world in favour of an institution known to be a creature of Freemasonry ought to appall every Catholic.

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

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

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

Pope John Paul II

The new Pope, who had been actively involved in the Council as a bishop, set himself the task of reinforcing his predecessor's initiative in *Redemptor Hominis*, claiming

there that he was continuing the program embarked on by Paul VI—

“this great predecessor of mine, who was truly my father...” [n. 4]

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

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

John Paul II’s endeavour drew the attention of German academic Dr Wigan Siebel, Professor of Political Science in Münster, Germany. In 1980 he published a criticism of it entitled *The Program of Pope John Paul II* which the reader is invited to download.³⁸ We adopt various salient elements of Dr Siebel’s critique in what follows.

Dr Siebel noted the Pope’s contention that the Church—

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

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

“The Church’s consciousness must go with the universal openness in order that all may be able to find in her ‘the

³⁸ Under the title *A Study of the Encyclical Redemptor Hominis*, translated from the German by Leonard Latkovski, M.A., O.S.J. with a preface by the translator, available at <http://www.the-pope.com/program2.html>

unsearchable riches of Christ' (*Eph.* 3: 8). This openness... gives the Church her apostolic urgency or her missionary dynamism..."

To which he added this telling observation:

"If the 'missionary dynamism' of the Church is in truth an opening of the Church to the whole wide world, the Pope can only be speaking of a kind of mission in reverse! This is a flooding of the Church by the world, while the Church exposes itself to this inundation through dialogue."³⁹

Dr Siebel went on to refer to the Pope's invocation of a new 'revelation', a term which invokes the Council bishops' redefining of 'tradition' in *Dei Verbum* 8 to allow fresh 'revelations', when he says —

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

Dr Siebel remarks, "Vatican II expressed the word of the Holy Ghost and therefore it is not permitted to give up the ecumenic initiative." He quoted the Pope again—

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

"Why," he asks, "does 'real ecumenical work' mean 'openness'? Because conversion to the Catholic Church and therewith to Catholic truth is not seriously required any more. The opening to the world, in fact, allows

³⁹ *A Study of the Encyclical Redemptor Hominis*, op. cit., Part II, The New Church, 1

entrance without conversion... [or] commitment. In place of conversion, there is 'dialogue'; instead of commitment to the truth, there is exchange of views and positions, which by its very nature never comes to an end; rather, all this is carried on in a 'mutual search for the truth'. If a person already has the truth in the form of Catholic doctrine, can he continue to 'seek for the truth', without actually turning away from it? ... When 'the Church' engages in a search *for the very thing which the Church is*, we must say that there is a serious incompatibility between Catholic doctrine and what is being spoken of."⁴⁰ [*emphasis added here*]

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

Our Blessed Lady

The Blessed Virgin Mary is the mother of the faithful in virtue of her freely consenting to be the Mother of the Saviour, Jesus Christ, Author of grace and of our spiritual regeneration, and of her Son's designation of her as such when he addressed the Apostle, John, from the Cross. She

⁴⁰ *A Study of the Encyclical Redemptor Hominis*, op. cit., Part II, The New Church, 4

is no less our mother than was Eve, for while we gain our human life from Eve, from Mary we gain the supernatural life of grace, a created participation in the Divine Life. This life is what St John is referring to in the prologue to his Gospel:

“He was in the world, the world was made through Him and the world knew Him not. He came into His own and His own received him not. But to as many as did receive Him He gave power to become sons of God, to those who believe in His name...”⁴¹

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

“It is... much more intimate and fruitful than ordinary human adoption... Divine adoption... produces sanctifying grace in the soul of the just, thereby making it to participate in the divine nature and to have within itself the germ of eternal life. The soul... endowed thus with grace... is [God’s] child, called to know Him face to face and to love Him for all eternity.”⁴²

In human adoption the child shares neither in the father’s family nor in his exercise of human nature. But in Divine adoption the baptised child shares in both the family of God the Father and His nature. In the natural order life is received without a wilful act. In the supernatural order life

⁴¹ *In mundo erat and mundus per ipsum factus est and mundus eum not cognovits; in propria venit et sui eum non receperunt; quotquot autem receperunt eum dedit eis potestatem filios Dei fieri, his qui credunt in nomine eius... John 1: 13*

⁴² Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange OP, Ph.D, S.T.D, *The Mother of the Saviour and Our Interior Life*, trans. Bernard J Kelly Cs.S.Sp., D.D., (Dublin 1949), pp. 188-9.

is received only with a wilful act, that of the child's parents, then of the man himself on reaching maturity. He must, to participate, believe in Christ's name and conform to His precepts.

Fr Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange teaches—

“[I]t is common and certain doctrine, and even *fidei proxima*, that the Blessed Virgin, Mother of the Redeemer, is associated with Him in the work of redemption as secondary and subordinate cause, just as Eve was associated with Adam in the work of man's ruin.”⁴³

In a footnote he adds—

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

He goes on to quote St Albert the Great—

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

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

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

⁴³ *The Mother of the Saviour and Our Interior Life*, op. cit., p. 184

As, by the ineffable providence of God, Mary was conceived immaculate, so when her Son established His Church, did He establish an entity likewise immaculate. The Church is His spotless bride. Like Mary she is a mother *but her motherhood is narrower* than that of the Blessed Virgin.⁴⁴ She is the mother only of those who conform to Christ and to His precepts by embracing her sacraments and her liturgy; in other words, she is mother only of the faithful.

'Mother of the Church'

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

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

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

Christ’s Church is holy and without blemish: immaculate. She fulfils faithfully her office under the guidance of her Head, Our Blessed Lord. She is compared to Mary. She

⁴⁴ Eve is the mother of all men *in act*. Their will does not come into it. In contrast, Mary is their mother only *in potency* because they obtain the supernatural life brought into the world through her Son Jesus Christ *only if they will it*. Yet her care for them as Mother is as universal as the Divine Salvific Will. *Daughter of God the Father, Spouse of God the Holy Spirit, Mother of God the Son*, she wills all men to be saved.

brings forth to new and immortal life children who are baptised. She is a mother in virtue of her imitation of Mary and, as such, the spotless spouse of Christ. To add to these the claim that Mary is ‘mother of the Church’ confuses the ground of these doctrines, disturbing the even tenor of the Church’s teaching. This is, doubtless, the reason why the Church has never employed the title, despite the fact that certain popes, bishops and theologians have done so.⁴⁵

The errors Paul VI committed in *Ecclesiam Suam* raise a justifiable doubt whether it was the Catholic Church to which he was referring, or the idealised ‘Church’ focused on man towards which ‘the Council’s’ bishops were moving under his inspiration. It is impossible that *this entity*—which John Paul II identified as ‘the Church of the New Advent’ but which is better designated *the Church of Vatican II*—could be of God.

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

“[I]f there is a ‘Mother of the Church’, then the very concept of the Church has... been changed, the time of its institution... pushed back. The Church as an institution can have no mother; she is the Mother of God’s People. At the same time, the parallel between Mary and the Church is discarded. As Mother of the Church, Mary stands above the Church; thus,

⁴⁵ As St Ambrose did; as Leo XIII did in the encyclical on the Rosary *Adjutricem populi* (September 5th 1895).

is destroyed the idea that Mary is the image of the Church, a concept which has a central importance in our traditional understanding...”⁴⁶

Verdict on Pope Paul VI

Paul VI was a Gnostic. He thought he knew better than Christ, knew better than the Church Christ had founded. This characteristic manifested itself in his reduction of a central issue of faith, the manner of offering Holy Mass, to a mere matter of discipline when in 1968, in breach of the Church’s prohibitions, he substituted for the millennial Roman Rite a rite of his own invention.

From all of the above the reader may be moved to agree with the writer that in *Ecclesiam Suam* Pope Paul VI initiated an attempt to divert the Catholic Church from the end intended by Almighty God that she should serve man’s salvation, to a means to advance the earthly ‘paradise’ of man, the ‘heaven’ of modernist heretics.

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

⁴⁶ *A Study of the Encyclical Redemptor Hominis*, op. cit., Part II, The New Church, 3

THE MODERNISM OF BENEDICT XVI

Having announced, on 11th February 2013, his abdication from office, Pope Benedict XVI addressed the clergy of Rome for the last time. His address is an eye-witness's account of the euphoria and misconceptions of a heterodox minority at Vatican II that led to the harm for which that 'Council' is responsible.

The address provides first-hand evidence that the chief influence at work among them was not the theology of the Catholic Church (and her philosophy) but the *nouvelle théologie* identified by Garrigou-Lagrange O.P. in 1946⁴⁷ and condemned by Pius XII in *Humani Generis*, an ideology grounded in modern philosophy's errors. It reveals, moreover, the Council bishops' embrace of the Protestant idyll of conscience, "not a revolutionary act but an act of responsibility", as they focused on themselves, rather than on Him to Whom they had pledged allegiance.

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

- keep up with the times;

⁴⁷ Doyen of the University of St Thomas Aquinas, in *La nouvelle théologie ou va-t-elle?* (Angelicum, 1946) reproduced as *Where is the new theology leading us?* at <https://ia902804.us.archive.org/26/items/Garrigou-LagrangeEnglish/Where%20is%20the%20New%20Theology%20Leading%20Us%20-%20Garrigou-Lagrange,%20Reginald,%20O.P..pdf>

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

One who reads what the late Pope has to say will have little difficulty discerning its modernist taint. “There was,” the Pope says, “a feeling the Church was not moving forward, that it was declining; that it seemed more a thing of the past...” This defers to the fictional ‘theology’ of Teilhard de Chardin which conceived of the Church as a work in progress, ‘on the way to perfection’, rather than the one perfect society on earth, as Leo XIII had taught.⁴⁸ Papa Ratzinger ignored, as had the bishops of Vatican II, the reality that while the Church exists in time she is, as a divine thing, outside time.

The late Pope went on—

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

⁴⁸ Leo XIII *Immortale Dei*, November 1st, 1885, n. 10. “This society [the Church] is made up of men, just as civil society is, and yet it is supernatural and spiritual on account of the end for which it was founded and of the means by which it aims at attaining that end. Hence it is distinguished and differs from civil society and, what is of the highest moment, it is a society chartered as of right divine, perfect in its nature and its title, to possess in itself, through the will and loving kindness of its Founder, all needful provision for its maintenance and action.”

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

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

“A clash between impudent folly and pompous autocracy [is] ... represented as a conflict between science and religion.”⁴⁹

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

⁴⁹ *Phoenix from the Ashes*, op. cit., pp. 93-100. The atheists of the French Revolution sent the father of modern chemistry, Antoine Lavoisier, to the guillotine. Though this action was much more grievous than that attributed to the Catholic Church over Galileo, never a word is published condemning atheism or its exponents.

council would dare endeavour what the bishops of 'Vatican II' attempted, to change the Church's reality.

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

His abandonment of distinction here, as with its abandonment by the Council's bishops generally, typifies the modernist rejection of the Church's philosophy and, by implication, rejection of her authority. For she has ever insisted, as we noted above, on exercise of the power of distinction as the essentially rational act.⁵⁰ The Church may have insisted time without number on her reliance on the Angelic Doctor's philosophy, Papa Ratzinger knew better (as did Papa Wojtyla before him)! His misquoting of St Thomas's teaching on the Trinity in support of the vacuous claim in *Lumen Gentium* n. 8 that the Church

⁵⁰ As St Thomas Aquinas insists, and Pius XII endorsed, in *Humani Generis* (12.8.1950). The idiosyncratic, because phenomenologist-infected, view of John Paul II in *Fides et Ratio* (14.9.1998), is in stark contrast.

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

Pope Benedict goes on in that Address to say:

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

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

In his condemnation of the Church’s perennial use of the Latin tongue and its rigour, as if these impeded rather than rendered precise the sound understanding of Catholic principle, and in his repetition of ‘the Council’s’ errors over involvement of the laity in the liturgy, Ratzinger repeats errors condemned by Pius VI of the pseudo-synod of Pistoia as “*rash, offensive to pious ears, insulting to the Church and favourable to the charges of heretics against it*”.

He goes further when he contends that the Council—

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

as if before the Council involvement of the faithful at Mass had been impeded!⁵¹ Implicit in this is denigration of the influence of the Holy Spirit in assuring the perfection of the Church's liturgy and the propriety of her protocols for man's salvation throughout history!

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

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

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

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

He blames what he describes as “the Council of the media” for the collapse of the priesthood and religious life that followed the Council, contending that while “the Council

⁵¹ *Auctorem Fidei* (August 28th, 1794): Dz. 1533; DS. 2633. Pius VI criticised the Pistoian bishops for speaking “as if the present order of the liturgy, received and approved by the Church, had emanated in some part from the forgetfulness of the principles by which it should be regulated”.

of the Fathers was conducted within the faith” this alternative “Council of the Media” was responsible for the damage that resulted. Here is another lie. It was not the media but the Council itself that led some 46,000 priests to abandon their ministries in the twenty years that followed its closure.⁵² He claims that “this virtual Council is broken, is lost,” so that “there now appears the true Council with all its spiritual force”. That this assertion is so much nonsense is manifest in the way the Council’s ravaging effects continued in the authority accorded its ‘teachings’ by his putative successor, ‘Pope’ Francis, to justify his depredations on the faith and the faithful alike.

Pope Benedict’s opposition to the teachings of St Thomas ought to have troubled those who had hoped his elevation to the papacy would lead to action against the evils the Council had set in train. His Address demonstrates, if there was nothing else available, that Ratzinger had always been part of the evils. His abdication – or purported abdication - of the Petrine office was no more than a symptom. If the Church is no different to any earthly corporation, what was to prevent its head from retiring when he found the job too demanding?

Papa Ratzinger’s conservatism had seemed to offer hope to the Catholic faithful. His actions showed a desire to console those attached to the traditional Roman rite of Holy Mass—better described, with reference to its

⁵² A figure which is conservative. It may have been as high as 70,000 according to Romano Amerio, *Iota Unum*, Kansas City, 1996, p. 182.

enduring form, as *the millennial rite*—in his Apostolic Letter *Summorum Pontificum* (July 7th, 2007), granting, so *the document said*, greater freedom to priests to celebrate that rite. His failure to advert to—

- the terms of canon 13 of the *Council of Trent's* Seventh Session, and
- the binding effects on the bishops and priests of the Church of Pius V's bull *Quo Primum* of July 1570,

cited above demonstrated deficiency in faith. *Summorum Pontificem* relied on the false premises of modern philosophy embraced by those who had attended the ersatz Council. There was another, and immensely ironical, consequence of this reliance as we noted above. His resignation was invalid.

In n. 27 of *Pascendi Dominice Gregis* (September 8th, 1907), Pius X had identified two types of modernist, the *progressive* and the *conservative*. Each of Benedict's predecessors back to, and including, John XXIII had been *progressive* modernists. Benedict may have been a conservative, he was not a Catholic. He was a *conservative modernist*.

Archbishop Viganò mentions another aspect of Pope Benedict's 'resignation'. The International Monetary Fund had suspended the operation of the SWIFT system preventing the passage of money into, and out of, the Vatican, a suspension which was lifted immediately Pope Benedict issued his Declaration. This intrusion of a secular influence on the workings of the Vatican bears the

hallmarks of intimidation, “of a grave fear unjustly inflicted” which, if borne out by objective evidence, adds another ground for the invalidity of his resignation.

Pope Benedict’s resignation being invalid, he remained Pope and the sentence in his Declaration is ineffectual which claims—

“that from the twenty-eighth day of February 2013, at the twentieth hour, the see of Rome, the See of St. Peter, will be vacant; and I declare that a Conclave to select a new highest pontiff needs to be convoked by those to whom the duty belongs”.

Since the Church’s two thousand years of tradition is eloquent of the fact that there can only ever be one Pope at a time, the conclave and election of his ‘successor’ was invalid, as well as being unlawful.

Accordingly, as Archbishop Viganò has remarked, after February 28th, 2013 and ‘the election’ of his ‘successor’,

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

Accordingly, from February 28th, 2013 until Benedict’s death on December 31st, 2022, the See of Rome was vacant. This *sedes vacancy* continued until the election of Pope Leo XIV on May 8th 2025.

THE TWO CHURCHES

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

Ps. 124: 3

The French have an expression—*les extremes se touchent*—‘the extremes meet’. In the persons of Pope Paul VI and the members of a vigorous minority of the attending bishops, two extremes, two evils, freemasonry and modernism, met at the synod of bishops held between 1962 and 1965, the ‘Second Vatican Council’. The two evils had the same source, the Protestant Revolt, but came via different routes. The one began shortly after that disaster; the other took centuries for its malevolence to appear.

Freemasonry was a ‘natural’ effect of Luther’s rejection of God’s authority in favour of that of the ‘believer’. The bastardised ‘belief’ to which it gave rise soon descended into Deism (which respects a God that exists only in the mind) and ended in a practical atheism. Freemasonry adopted the Protestant protocol of vain oaths by which tyrants such as Henry Tudor (King Henry VIII) via his creature Thomas Cromwell, compelled his subjects, through fear, to swear before God that what was false was true, what was true was false,⁵³ thus confirming by breach

⁵³ On this topic see E. E. Reynolds, *The Field is Won: The Life and Death of St Thomas More*, Milwaukee, 1968, pp. 294 et seq., and particularly footnote 8.

of the *Second* Commandment, their betrayal of the *First* when they abandoned the Catholic faith.

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

Pius X condemned the modernist heresy comprehensively in 1907 (*Pascendi Dominici Gregis*) but it reappeared among rebellious priests and theologians in the decades that followed, given expression in a thesis of the proto-modernist, George Tyrell SJ, the *nouvelle théologie*. Pius XII condemned its tenets anew in 1950 in *Humani Generis*.

Masons and *modernists*, then, not so much by their numbers as by the pertinacity of ideas and their control of both John XXIII (implicitly), and Paul VI (explicitly), dominated the gathering at the 'Second Vatican Council' to divert to man, the honour due Almighty God. They did so via the modernist protocols, *syncretism* (all religions are

the same) and *humanism* (if religion is to have any focus, it is man, not God). The masons' contribution was to apply the atheistic triduum of the French Revolution, *liberty, equality and fraternity*. At 'the Council', these became *religious liberty, collegiality and ecumenism*.

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

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

Just as malevolent were the effects it was to work in the decades that followed.

The two Popes together with the Council's bishops—complaisant, or unthinking, or just plain negligent—permitted the malevolent vocal minority in their midst to drive them to embrace modern philosophy's facile tenets in place of the Catholic Church's perennial philosophy. It will assist if we elaborate the consequences of this collective action on the thinking of its proponents and on the lives of the faithful who depended on them.

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

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

- Divine faith, the gift of God, and Catholic / the merely human faith of every other religion.⁵⁴

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

The Two Churches

It must first be insisted that the rot which precipitated the emergence of the *counterfeit* began with John XXIII. His failures as a bishop and cardinal ought to have ensured that he would never be *papabilus*. His serial disobedience to the Church’s teaching and of the directions of his predecessor, Pius XII, ensured that, once elected he would treat with disdain the principles in the papal oath instituted by Pope St Agatho (678 – 681)—

“I vow to change nothing of the received Tradition, nothing thereof I have found guarded by my God-pleasing predecessors before me, [nor] to encroach upon, to alter, or to permit any innovation therein...”

⁵⁴ The verb ‘to confuse’ and its cognate noun ‘confusion’ are apt, for they signify ‘poured together’.

John XXIII's decision to invoke a synod of the Church's bishops to 'update' the Church revealed how his Catholic faith had become submerged in the spirit of the world. He thought it sufficient that he label a synod of bishops 'ecumenical' for it to be an ecumenical, or general, council of the Catholic Church. This is subjectivism at work: the truth is what I assert it to be.

But *what something is*, its essence or nature, is a function of *why it is: finality determines formality*. The only reason that can justify a general, or ecumenical, council of the Catholic Church is the need to address some issue crucial to her good. *There was no such issue*. John XXIII admitted as much in his opening speech. Three years later, his successor, Paul VI, confirmed it in his closing speech.⁵⁵

By this shared act of papal incompetence, a way was opened for the invasion of the sanctuary of God by the devil. Paul VI was to lament the fact publicly some seven years after the Council's closing, utterly blind to his own responsibility for it.⁵⁶

It is possible to identify 'the Church' produced by Paul VI and the Council's bishops and give it a name, or names. One was supplied by the Pope's Deputy Secretary of State, In June 1976, Archbishop Giovanni Benelli, at the bidding of his principal, Jean Cardinal Villot, as he sought to divert

⁵⁵ For a study of this reality see *The Trouble with Dignitatis Humanae—II. The Dilemma*, at

https://www.superflumina.org/PDF_files/dignitatis_humanae_2.pdf

⁵⁶ Statement of June 29th, 1972

Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, one of the ‘rebel’ bishops at the Council, from ordaining candidates to the priesthood dedicated to offering Mass in the millennial Roman rite. Benelli promised the archbishop that Rome would look after his seminarians if they were “seriously prepared for a priestly ministry in true loyalty to the *Conciliar Church*”.⁵⁷

The archbishop ignored him and ordained the priests on June 29th. Three weeks later the Secretary of the *Sacred Congregation of Bishops* advised him that Paul VI had imposed on him the punishment of suspension *a divinis*, depriving him of the right to confect the sacraments. The archbishop’s reaction is instructive:

“When all is said and done, this suspension forbids me... to say the New Mass or to give the new sacraments. I am asked to obey the ‘Conciliar Church’, as Archbishop Benelli calls it. But this Conciliar Church is schismatic because it breaks with the Catholic Church of all time. It has its new dogmas... its new priesthood, its new institutions, and its new liturgy which have... been condemned in so many official and definitive documents.”⁵⁸

In this comment, the archbishop exposed for us the reality of *the Two Churches*.

Despite the claim implicit in Paul VI’s conduct, that he had acted as Pope in imposing this penalty, the facts show that

⁵⁷ Paul VI had used the expression *Conciliar Church* in an address to lay leaders in 1966.

⁵⁸ Quoted in Bishop Tissier de Mallerai, *The Biography Marcel Lefebvre*, transl. from the French by Brian Sudlow M.A., Kansas City MO, (Angelus Press) 2004 at p. 487.

he had acted in another capacity, that of superior of the *Conciliar Church*. Since this entity was a merely human enterprise—its operations and direction contrary to those of Christ’s Church—it was quite incapable of providing the Pope with the power he purported to exercise.

Paul VI died just over two years later in August 1978. In March the following year his successor, Pope John Paul II, in his first encyclical, *Redemptor Hominis*, gave the counterfeit Church another name, *the Church of the New Advent*.⁵⁹ But it is best identified, by reference to its source, as *the Church of Vatican II*.

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

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

⁵⁹ John Paul made it clear the entity he was referring to was *not* the Catholic Church by omitting any mention of the Catholic Church or the Catholic faith.

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

But the Church’s desire to awaken the Jews to the reality that the long-expected Saviour had already appeared in the person of Jesus Christ, did not diminish the reality that their malice had brought about His suffering and death, for which they were justly condemned. For fifteen centuries the Church had invoked the teaching of St Augustine on the topic, reproduced in Matins during the Easter Triduum, *but John XXIII knew better than Christ’s Church!* How rightly did Pius X remark of its exponents: “Pride sits in modernism as in its own house”.

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

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

* It explains why the Church's bishops are so ineffectual, why one never hears one of them speak out on any of the innumerable moral disorders that arise in society every week. Since each celebrates *daily* this defective rite of Mass, *he is conforming himself to its defective law of belief* which includes a heterodox attitude to absolute and moral liberty.⁶⁰ Though each bishop insists upon his episcopal dignity, the vast majority conduct themselves as superiors of the schismatic *Church of Vatican II*.

* It explains the confusion among those traditional Catholics who think that the authorisation of priests to

⁶⁰ In *Dignitatis Humanae* n. 3, the Council proclaimed: "No merely human power can either command or prohibit [the internal, voluntary and free] acts [whereby a man sets the course of his life directly towards God]." This false exaltation of absolute liberty rejects the ordinary teaching of the Catholic Church contained in Leo XIII's *Libertas praestantissimum* (June 20th, 1888), and the social Kingship of Christ proclaimed by Pius XI in *Quas Primas* (December 11th, 1925). Leo said: "it is quite unlawful to demand, to defend, or to grant unconditional freedom of thought, of speech, or writing, or of worship as if these were so many rights given by nature to man. [If it was so] it would be lawful to refuse obedience to God and there would be no restraint on human liberty." (*Libertas*, n. 42)

offer, and of faithful to attend, the millennial form of the Roman Rite of Mass comes from the current pope, rather than from the Church herself. When they conceded, as a condition of the celebration, and their attendance at, the millennial Roman rite, the legitimacy of 'the Second Vatican Council', they became trapped into conceding Paul VI's principle, that the mode of offering Mass *is never more than a matter of discipline*. This being conceded, any pope after Benedict XVI was entitled to suppress it, and they were bound to obey him rather than his predecessor *because no pope can bind his successor in a matter of discipline*.

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

* It explains the endeavours of recent popes and bishops to foist the nonsense of synodality on the faithful, an evil begun by Paul VI in 1967. This abuse is grounded in two errors promoted by the Council and embraced by *the Church of Vatican II*: that the Catholic Church should be a democratic rather than hierarchical institution, and that the laity should have a voice in her management and government. 'Vatican II's' denial of the reality (despite its bishops' protestations to the contrary) that she has a living

Head in Jesus Christ, that she is subservient to Him and therefore hierarchical in structure, coupled with abandonment of the explicit teaching of Pius X in *Pascendi* n. 27, against these contentions, illustrates once again the illegitimacy of the claim that ‘the Council’ was a work of the Catholic Church.

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

* It explains ‘Pope’ Francis’s direction that the Catholic Church’s teaching on the death penalty be reversed and that the 1994 *Catechism* be amended accordingly. The issue is a modernist fetish. It was shared by his modernist predecessors, John Paul II and Benedict XVI. John Paul had called for its abolition as early as 1999, labouring the point in public utterances throughout his pontificate.

Benedict repeated the call in his 2011 Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation *Africae Munus*.

But the Catholic Church's teaching remains what it has ever been, that there are circumstances where the good of society demands that a man be put to death:

“[T]he common good is better than the particular good of one person. So, a particular good should be removed in order to preserve the common good. But the life of certain pestiferous men is an impediment of the common good which is the concord of human society. Therefore, certain men must be removed by death from the society of men...

“[Just as] the physician properly and beneficially removes a diseased organ if the corruption of the body is threatened... the ruler of a state executes pestiferous men justly and sinlessly in order that the peace of the state may not be disrupted.”⁶¹

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

Communicatio in Sacris

Perhaps nothing better distinguishes the two Churches—that the one is of God, the other of man, and the devil—than their respective attitudes to *communicatio in sacris*, the sharing by priests or faithful of the holy things of God

⁶¹ St Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles*, Bk. III, ch. 145, nn. 4, 5.

with unbelievers, or the sharing by priests or faithful in the services or 'sacraments' of unbelievers.

St Paul in II *Corinthians* (6: 15-16) is explicit:

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

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

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

To which Canon 2316 added this force:

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

In contrast, the new *Code*, designed by Paul VI's advisers *inter alia* to pass into law the errors of 'Vatican II' (to be published under Pope Paul, then under Pope John Paul; finally promulgated by John Paul II on January 25th, 1983) contains provisions, Canons 844 § 2, 3 and 4, *which allow communicatio in sacris* explicitly. Thus, Canon 844 § 4— If there is a danger of death or if, in the judgement of the diocesan bishop or of the episcopal conference, there is some other grave and pressing need, Catholic ministers may lawfully administer these same sacraments to other Christians not in full communion with the Catholic Church who cannot approach a minister of their own community and

who spontaneously ask for them, provided they demonstrate the Catholic faith in respect of these sacraments and are properly disposed.

Since these provisions traduce the constant teaching of the Catholic Church, it is impossible they could be part of a Code of Canon Law of the Catholic Church. They can only be provisions of a Code for the schismatic *Church of Vatican II*.⁶²

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

⁶² The same comment can be made of the new Canon 1055 § 1 with its reversal of the order of the ends of marriage, a reflection of the Protestant error adopted by the Council's bishops in *Gaudium et Spes* n. 48. There St Paul's teaching in *Ephesians* 5: 25 is misquoted as if authorising the novelty. In nn. 50 and 51 the change in emphasis, subtle but real, is maintained. Paul VI repeated the error in *Humanae Vitae* nn. 9 & 12.

THE CATHOLIC DILEMMA & HOW TO SOLVE IT

At the time of writing, members of the Catholic faithful throughout the world are confronted with a great dilemma. The pope, Leo XIV, Vicar of Christ on earth, successor of him to whom Our Blessed Lord said: “Thou art Peter and on this rock I will build my Church... and the gates of hell will not prevail against it”, conducts himself daily like a modernist heretic. How, is this possible? Haven’t the gates of hell prevailed?

Let us make it clear in what follows that we are not judging the *subjective* state of the soul of the Pontiff. Pius X mentioned the applicable principle in a preliminary note, in n. 3, of his encyclical against the modernists, *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* (September 8th, 1907):

“Although they [modernists] express their astonishment that we should number them among the enemies of the Church, no one will be reasonably surprised that We do so if, leaving out of account the internal disposition of the soul, of which God alone is the judge, he considers their tenets, their manner of speech and their action...”⁶³

We are confronted with a dilemma. How does one solve a dilemma? Are there rules, and if so, what are they? It will help if we study two dilemmas that presented themselves at the very beginnings of philosophy, and see how they were resolved.

⁶³ The Church’s maxim is *De internis Ecclesia non iudicat*.

Being and Becoming - Parmenides of Elea (fl. 475 BC) contended that change is impossible. Whatever exists, exists: it cannot come into existence. *Becoming*, therefore, is an illusion. Against this view, Heraclitus of Ephesus (fl. 500 BC), said true, *being* exists, but it is constantly changing. No thing is fixed; it is always becoming something else. "We never," he said, "step twice into the same river". Who was right?

One and Many - Parmenides said that the *many-ness* of things is apparent only. In truth, being is one, not many. As might be expected from what had he to say, noted above, Heraclitus said reality is *pure many-ness*. The only unity in being is its multiplicity. Who was right?

Let the reader note that each of the two philosophers saw the answer to each dilemma in a denial of the information of his senses, namely, (1) that things *do come into being, and go out of being*, and that once it has come into being, a thing maintains its itself in existence; and, (2) that notwithstanding that they are united in having one exemplar, or image, there are yet many, real, instances of each thing. True, dogs conform to one type, but there are *many real dogs!*

Plato (428 – 347 BC) attempted to solve the issue of the one and the many with his doctrine of subsisting forms. He said there exists a real, universal, One, of everything we observe—as that, the many dogs we observe are no more than reflections of the One, Universal, real, Dog—and we

are like spectators at the entrance to a cave who observe, on its back wall, the reflections of the reality behind us.⁶⁴

His student, Aristotle (384 – 322 BC), accepted the facts presented by both dilemmas. Things both come into being and remain in being he noted. Moreover, the unity of things in conforming to one type is not contradicted by the fact that the type is found in many individuals. He looked for a reason of their *becoming* and for a reason of their *being*; he looked for a reason of their *one-ness*, and a reason of their *many-ness*. He accepted *both* terms of each and sought to solve them by distinctions. Before proceeding further, then, let us, following Aristotle, formulate the first rule for solving a dilemma.

Rule no. 1: accept both terms.

Of being and becoming - Aristotle asserted that a distinction is to be made in being. Close analysis reveals that *being* is comprised not only of what is, but of *what can be*. *What is* = being in act (*actus*, literally, ‘does-[be]-ness’). *What can be* = being in *potency* (*potentia*, literally, ‘can-be-ness’). An illustration: Sir Isaac Newton *does be* an astronomer: he is an astronomer *in act*. John Patrick, a boy, *can be* an astronomer: he is an astronomer *in potency*. John Pat’s dog, Toby, cannot be an astronomer. Thus, there is an element of being, *potency*, in John Patrick not found in his dog.

⁶⁴ This theory was later characterised as Extreme Realism.

Of the one and the many - Aristotle said Plato's doctrine of subsisting forms was unnecessary and would not save the validity of human knowledge. The *universal* is not a mere fiction, a figment, of the mind. *It is something real which exists in the mind.* It is not necessary that it subsist in its own right apart from the individuals in which it is exemplified: it suffices that it exists in mind. Plato's hypothesised *material* images are no more than duplicates of the sensible world. In contrast, the *immaterial* existence of the universal in mind permits the mind to apply it to each individual. From the manner of Aristotle's solution to these two dilemmas we have, then, a key for formulating the second, and critical, rule in solving a dilemma.

Rule no. 2: look for a distinction in one term, or in the other term, or in both.

The Dilemma Concerning the Pope's Behaviour

Here are the issues laid out in the form of questions: *Is Leo XIV the duly constituted successor of St Peter? Does he conduct himself day by day as a modernist heretic?* There are three possible answers to the questions:

- 'No': Leo is not Pope so the question of his engagement in heresy does not arise, save for the scandal it gives to the uninstructed - this is the *sedevacantist* position.
- 'No': Leo does not act like a heretic; whatever he says is Catholic teaching - this is the *ultramontanist* position, that no matter what the pope does, he cannot err. The second question is irrelevant.

- ‘Yes’: Leo is the Pope; and yes, he conducts himself like a modernist heretic. This is the *Catholic* position.

To find the solution we must look for a distinction in the one term – *that Leo is truly the Pope of the Catholic Church* – or in the other, *that he conducts himself each day as a modernist heretic*, or in both. Let us look at the first.

Is the Pope always infallible? No: he is not. The *Vatican Council* in chapter 4 of its Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Pastor Aeternus* (July 18th 1870), laid out the circumstances in which the Pope speaks infallibly, namely,

- when carrying out his duty as pastor and teacher of all Christians,
- in accord with his supreme apostolic authority,
- he explains a doctrine of faith or morals,
- to be held by the universal Church.

It is *because a pope can err* that the *Vatican Council* laid out precisely when he cannot!⁶⁵ It is entirely possible, then, that a pope could indulge in error to the point of uttering words which are not only materially, but formally, heretical. It has happened in the past: there is no reason why it should not happen again.

⁶⁵ Anyone who doubts what is said here is invited to listen carefully to the elaboration by the late Fr Gregory Hesse STD, SJD, of the history of the errors committed by bad and heretical popes at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V2fzD6fRae0&list=PL6l_8ruHs bA2EkMiTdhBG4YS6rjl-8RVR&index=12

We are conscious that there are Doctors of the Church who claim that teaching formal heresy would put a pope outside the Church. None of them were confronted with the problems that the modernist heresy has thrown up and, consistent with St Augustine's principle that heresies provide the Church with the opportunity of refining her teachings, we leave resolution of the issue to the Church in due course. The claim presents problems, the first of which is the maxim long held by the Church, set forth in canon 1404 of the 1983 CIC, *Prima sedes a nemine iudicatur*—"The first see is judged by no one". The second problem is a practical one. Any action to remove an heretical pope from the Church could only be taken by a competent body of the cardinals. In the present situation, where a majority of the cardinals are infected with the modernist virus, solution to this problem is unlikely in the extreme.

Before proceeding it is necessary to address another issue an objector might raise: was Leo XIV validly elected? We can see no reason why he was not. The fact that his electors, or many of them, were infected with the modernist virus would not render their votes invalid—*illicit*, certainly, but *not invalid*. Nor would Robert Cardinal Prevost's infection with the modernist virus prevent his election as pope. Again, his election would be *illicit*, but valid. (There is no suggestion of an impediment to validity of the election such as that which rendered Jorge Bergoglio's election invalid in 2013.)

Let us look at the other term. Is there a distinction which would isolate Papa Prevost's general behaviour so as to remove it from the sphere of Papal authority completely? Yes, there is.

Does the Pope always act as Pope? No. He does not. Pope Leo is not only the Vicar of Christ, earthly head of the Catholic Church, he is head of the secular, and diabolical, entity invented by the popes and bishops of 'Vatican II', *the Church of Vatican II*. He may think as he goes about his affairs each day that he always acts as Pope. But the reality is that, most of the time, Papa Prevost conducts himself as head of this modernist entity.

His heresy is grounded in modern philosophy which eschews all acknowledgement of the *formal* in human thinking, contents itself with merely *material* explanations. It rejects the need for distinction, essential to rational thought, which entails acceptance of the reality of the different *formalities* in a thing, or action, so as to permit its identification. As with the philosophy which underlies it, the modernist heresy rejects distinction, contents itself with materialism's facile analyses and explanations.

What, the reader might ask himself, would happen if it was suggested to Pope Leo that he is head not only of the Catholic Church but also of this other Church, *the Church of Vatican II*? It is highly likely he would shake his head in disbelief, and insist that there is only one Church, the Catholic Church, of which he is the earthly head. He

would, doubtless, say that what the Church referred to in the past as ‘a modernist heresy’ is now part and parcel of Catholic ethos. “Why,” he might reasonably respond, “look at the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*! Look at the *Code of Canon Law*! Where in either of them, is there any criticism of modernism?”

He might go on: “Whatever the Church and her doctors may have thought in the past about the faith being an *objective* reality grounded in existence of an *objective* God on Whom all men are utterly dependent, *since the revelations of Vatican II* we know that this explanation was no more than a delusion! All religion comes from *within man*: no religion, not even Catholicism, is superior to another, as Vatican II made clear.”

How else could one explain why the Pope would so abandon Catholic principle as to welcome in the Vatican King Charles, the head of the Anglican Church, the institution that martyred hundreds of Catholics in the sixteenth century? How else explain why he would welcome in the Vatican, and invite to pray with him, the female ersatz-archbishop of Canterbury, Dame Sarah Mullally? It simply does not concern him that he had, in these two insouciant acts, contravened the Church’s formal teaching *against Anglican orders* of his predecessor, Leo XIII, in *Apostolicae Curae* (September 13th, 1896), and (by implication) that of John Paul II’s doctrinal apostolic letter *against the possibility of a woman aspiring to the priesthood* in *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis* (May 22nd, 1994).

Pope Leo is a *progressive* modernist within the meaning accorded that term by Pius X in *Pascendi* n. 27, and sees no difficulty in departing from Church teaching in faith or morals. For the modernist, doctrine is mutable. It must adapt to 'the faith' of the believer, and Pope Leo is laying out for his fellow modernists how that 'faith' is shifting its focus. In the instances cited, as in innumerable of his other words and actions, Pope Leo has not acted as a Catholic at all.

He has threatened, through the head of the ersatz 'Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith', to apply his modernist principles to the proposed Catholic action of the bishops of the *Society of St Pius X* to consecrate bishops to ensure the future ordination of Catholic priests, that is, *priests who will not bear the incubus of the modernist synod*, 'the Second Vatican Council'.

Let us note it carefully. When he does that, he will not be acting as Pope but as head of that counterfeit, and human, 'Church' that synod invented identified, successively, as *the Conciliar Church* (by Paul VI), as *the Church of the New Advent* (by John Paul II in *Redemptor Hominis*, and elsewhere), but is most accurately described (from its source) as *the Church of Vatican II*.

*By their fruits you shall know them; do men gather grapes
from thorns, or figs from thistles?*

*Even so, good trees bring forth good fruit and the evil tree
brings forth evil fruit.⁶⁶*

⁶⁶ *Matthew* 7: 15, 16

The Effect of a Decree of Suspension or Excommunication

With these considerations in mind, we are able to gauge the weight and effect of any decree of suspension or excommunication Pope Leo may issue, or authorise, against those persons intent on adhering to Catholic, as opposed to modernist, principle. When context, or the reasoning advanced, demonstrates that the Pope is moved not by *Catholic* principles but by *modernist* ones, the penalty can safely be ignored. For it will be clear that the Pope is acting not as Vicar of Christ, but head of the counterfeit, *Church of Vatican II*.

It is instructive to recall the comment made by Archbishop Lefebvre on July 29th, 1976 after he had been advised by the Vatican that he had incurred the penalty of suspension *a divinis* for ordaining priests in the *Society of St Pius X*:

“In reality, in what does [the suspension] consist? ... I am forbidden to celebrate the new Mass, to confer the new sacraments, and to preach the new doctrine.

“Thus, precisely because I have refused these novelties since their institution, I am now officially forbidden to use them. It is because I refuse the new Mass that I am prevented from saying it. One may thereby perceive how little harm this suspension causes me...”

Precisely, indeed! What Catholic would care if he woke to the news that he had been excommunicated from the *Church of Vatican II*? He has never been a member of that ghastly institution in the first place!
