

VATICAN II

An Essay by Frits Albers, Ph.B.

On behalf of the Australian Marian Academy of the Immaculate
Conception.

PREFACE

This third edition of *Vatican II* is a reworked update of an article of mine that was first published on the Feast of the Holy Rosary, Saturday, October 7, 1978, and reprinted in 1995. It is being made available with the same hope that accompanied the first edition: that it may help Catholic readers to understand a bit better the deep Mystery that lies hidden in this great Council of the Holy Church that caused the writing of this little booklet in the first place.

It is by now an open secret that the Second Vatican Council is viewed by many orthodox Catholics, if not with a sort of latent hostility, then at least with open suspicion. This is largely (but, as we will see, not exclusively, for God never removes from us our free will) the direct result of the fury and ferocity with which the Modernists have seized on the post-Conciliar period in their determination to be heard as the exclusive interpreters of the letter and the spirit of this Council. Their relentless drive has created the unavoidable impression that all the modern heresies can be traced back to this great Council. And the silence and timidity of the ones, appointed by God to be the authentic teachers in the Church (with the notable exception of the late Pope *Paul VI* and some very courageous bishops) did not help much to restore morale and confidence.

When my article *In Defence of the Novus Ordo* did the rounds, the reaction of not a few was “that Vatican II had itself to blame for the run-down of the Liturgy”. Others reacted to my latest article *Our Lady* with the incredulous reply: “But Vatican II is supposed to have downgraded devotion to Our Lady ...” They found it hard to believe that so much beautiful teaching on the Mother of God, “the New Eve” and “the Mother of the Church” could come from a Council which had so obviously been subject to much dilution from the ‘Rhine’: the Northern Alliance of liberal bishops and their so-called ‘experts’.

That, under these circumstances, many good Catholics are confused about Vatican II, is understandable. And then it does not help to recommend the teachings of the Second Vatican Council to these good and simple Catholics, if they repeatedly hear from teachers, catechists, Priests and other experts that they are too much pre-

Vatican II in their thinking. For this rebuke contains the barb that *Vatican II* made essential changes in doctrine, and that the old is no longer acceptable.

In support of the above it is possible to quote our present Holy Father from a recent address he gave to a group of North American Bishops at their “Ad Limina” visit on October 9, 1998. In this speech the Holy Father made the following observation:

“To look back over what has been done in the field of liturgical renewal in the years since the Council is, first, to see many reasons for giving heartfelt thanks and praise to the Most Holy Trinity for the marvelous awareness which has developed among the faithful of their role and responsibility in this priestly work of Christ and His Church. It is also to realise that not all changes have always and everywhere been accompanied by the necessary explanation and catechesis. As a result, in some cases there has been a misunderstanding of the very nature of the liturgy, leading to abuses, polarization, and sometimes even grave scandal. After the experience of more than thirty years of liturgical renewal, we are well placed to assess both the strength and the weakness of what has been done, in order more confidently to plot our course into the future which God has in mind for His cherished People”.

Adding my humble comments to the above quoted remarks of Pope *John Paul II*, I would like to repeat what I wrote on Oct. 23, 1977 to a distinguished Roman theologian, in reply to a letter of his to me (May 25):

“To me, it is an article of faith, that it is absolutely impossible and useless to consider and discuss *Vatican II* without an absolute acceptance, i.e. an acceptance in Faith, of the Eternal Truths taught by the pre-Vatican II Church. The same Church that gave us the *Syllabus of Errors* gave us *Vatican II*. If I cannot induce my adversary to agree with me on pre-Vatican II teachings, it is utterly futile to look with him at *Vatican II*. If he attacks me for my adherence to pre-Vatican II teachings he is bound to disagree with me on the authentic interpretation to be given to the teachings of *Vatican II*, because this authentic interpretation can only come from an uninterrupted Catholic Tradition. If my articles are rejected because of my adherence to pre-Vatican II sources and teachings, they will be rejected because of my adherence to authentic *Vatican II* teachings. In fact, we see this plainly happening already: the teilhardians are so disillusioned with *Vatican II*, that they only casually, almost from reflex, link their erroneous effluent to this great Council. They know by now that their teachings are *not* found there, and they are looking forward to Vatican III, or Jerusalem II. The Holy Father Pope *Paul VI* himself is almost exclusively pre-Vatican II

lately, linking up the teachings of this Council with Catholic Tradition”.

This reference to Vatican III became substantiated with the appearance of the book called *Toward Vatican III* some 7 months later (mid 1978) containing the papers of the same “world famous theologians” and “experts” who, with their declaration in the *London Times* immediately prior to the Conclave, convened for the election of a successor to the late Pontiff Pope *Paul VI*, demanded stringent reforms of the Papacy, calling on the Cardinals not only to elect “*a worldly pope*”, but also, prior to the election, “*to ponder over the Ten Point proposal contained in their joint declaration, and to devote the first part of this month’s conclave to a discussion of the declaration before they elected a new Pope*”. [Are we not constantly reminded, in dealing with these people, of the immortal words of His Holiness Pope *St. Pius X* in his encyclical *Pascendi*: “*Audacity is their chief characteristic*”?]

It is instructive to read in the “joint declaration” that the Cardinals are urged by these heretics “*to elect a pope who will not be a doctrinaire defender of ancient bastions ... and who will share power with the bishops...*” And in case the good Cardinals missed the point, the declaration “*suggested the need for a reform of the papacy as an institution, with the pope looking on the synod of bishops as a responsible decision-making body*”. Neither the language nor the intentions could be any clearer.

I have read *Toward Vatican III*, and, as is to be expected, it is empty of Theologia Sacra and full of human and social engineering, values clarifications, contradictions of Catholic Teaching and even heresies. It is a monumental testimony by the architects of the “*One-World Church*” of their final rejection of *Vatican II*. Unable to trace their frightful dissent any longer to this great and mysterious Council, they have resolved to make it the blue-print of a future ‘council’, so that already this dissent can be given the immediate benefit and respectability of “*inevitable conciliar teachings*” of the future ...

Finally, a word about the well-known book by Fr. *Ralph Wiltgen*, SVD: *The Rhine Flows into the Tiber*. This book, more than anything else, should explain why the above-mentioned architects of the “*Church of Darkness*” are despairing of *Vatican II*. The Council simply did not go their way in spite of the apparent dominant influence of the ‘Rhine’: the Northern Alliance of the liberal-catholic bishops and their periti. Here follows a typical passage of the book, p. 158, expressing someone’s acute disappointment:

“*Prof. Oscar Cullmann*, a guest of the *Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity*, gave a lengthy press conference at the end of the Council, in the course of which he said:

“We cannot pass over in silence the disappointment that we

experienced at seeing the title of *Mediatrix* given to Mary ... The fact that the text on Mary, after so much discussion as to where it should be placed, should have finally become the concluding chapter of the Schema on the Church - a decision which was in fact intended to weaken Mariology - has in reality made it even stronger, because everything stated about the Church culminates, so to speak, in this chapter ... Mariology at this Council has in general been intensified to a degree which is not in keeping with the ecumenical tendencies of Protestantism ... What was expected was a weakening of emphasis, **not some sort of revision of the fundamental relationship to the Virgin Mary.**”

Is any further proof needed to show how skilfully the Holy Spirit used the bad intentions of some bishops, even of a dominant group of bishops, for His own designs? Whoever rejects or even mistrusts *Vatican II* on the basis of appearances, like the title of Fr. Wiltgen’s book, should seriously examine their Faith in pre-Conciliar teachings to see how ‘accommodating’ this Faith has become to unconsciously held private opinions and prejudices, and how adept we all had become in cushioning ourselves against the more uncomfortable demands of the Cross made upon this Faith.

The all-time greatness and mystery of Vatican Council II lies hidden in the Mystery of the Church and points to the fact that, as a Beacon in the blackness of 20th century humanity, it has made all Catholics uncomfortable by the stark outline of a Cross. Not a Cross safely separated from us by some 2000 years of history, but the harsh outline of a Cross we have been at pains to overlook, but which we are now forced to recognize inescapably, as our very own. Now that many a support we had so earnestly labelled as “essential” simply because we found them so comfortable and reassuring, have been taken away from us, we are suddenly faced with the duty to measure our pre-Vatican II Faith and the strength it has to support us in the post-Conciliar turmoil. Or to stay within the parable of Our Lord Himself, *we are faced with the responsibility of measuring the amount of oil we had taken with us before we fell asleep ...*

With these thoughts we have strayed from the province of the Preface (which is to supply a reason *why* the article should be written) into the domain of the Introduction, in which is outlined in what light the article should be viewed.

INTRODUCTION

Here I can be brief. I will view the subject-matter of this article in the same Light as I viewed all the others: the Supernatural Light of Divine and Catholic Faith and that of the teachings of the Holy Catholic Church. I do not merely write theology: I write to strengthen the Catholic Faith of my readers: their Faith in that Supernatural Reality here on earth: the Catholic Church.

In earlier articles I examined before them the strange doctrines that have found their way “*into the heart and veins of the Church*” (*Pascendi*), and traced them to their common origin: Teilhard de Chardin and his brand of evolution which is nothing but *systematic Modernism*. At the same time I drew attention to the concerted and global attempts to trace these spurious teachings and principles to the Second Vatican Council, to make them more readily acceptable as genuine, post-Conciliar ‘Catholic’ insights. This was the necessary spade work for subsequent articles.

In the more recent ones, I have contrasted these twistings of Catholic Dogma with the teachings of the authentic Catholic Magisterium, endeavouring - as already mentioned in the Preface - to show that no authentic pre-Conciliar teaching of the Church can be, nor ever was, at variance with the true teachings of Vatican II. Yet more is required. Vatican II is more than a sum-total of teachings. It has an inspiration all on its own: a uniqueness and mystery which can only be fully resolved in time, when future generations will give glory to God for His loving Providence.

There is something that only *we* can do, for our own generation as well as for the future. *We know* from what Church and from what era this Sacred Council sprung forth, and from where it took root and formation. And this vital information will diminish in time for future generations. In support of this fading of understanding historical values already in the present generation of the young people we may quote the present Holy Father from the same address quoted above to the North American Bishops in Rome when he said:

“... In this sense the young are summoning the whole Church to take the next step in implementing the vision of worship which the Council has bequeathed on us. Unencumbered by the ideological agenda of an earlier time they are able to speak simply and directly of their desire to experience God”

The Holy Father is aware that it is a good thing not to be burdened by past ideological strife. But the whole tone of his address is to rectify a wide-spread misconception: that *Vatican II* constituted a break in Catholic Tradition at least as far as the liturgy of the Church is concerned. For that very reason he was at pains to link the past with the present, going in his address as far back in time as the Fathers and

Doctors of the Church.

It is from our era, and from the Church of our era, still so close to us, that we must wrestle to partly unlock the mystique contained in the very essence of *Vatican II*. For our own immediate benefit as well as for the benefit of the Catholics to whom Catholic Tradition must be handed over in its entirety. No doubt *Vatican II* has a clear message for the Church of the future, but this great Council happened *in our time*, and future generations of Catholics depend on us how well we understood that time. How well our Catholic children will comprehend the *past* which happens to be our *present*, depends entirely on us.

CHAPTER ONE

THE PRE-VATICAN II CATHOLIC SCENE.

Broadly speaking, this scene comprises - amongst a multitude of others - two groups of people.

I. *Firstly*, those who attempt to live entirely within the Tradition of the Roman Catholic Church. Those who take the Church's living Tradition and the teaching of the Magisterium for their rich soil, from which they draw up the sustenance to carry out the command given by the Lord: 'To live in the world but not from the world'. With their sinfulness and their human weaknesses and imperfections, we must still refer to this group as 'the holy people of God'.

Those struggling fathers and mothers who during the years of the Great Depression refused to limit their families by artificial contraception; who reared their children in "the fear of God which is the beginning of Wisdom"; who understood the true meaning of the Church's Sacramental Life and who accepted the necessity for bringing sacrifices themselves in order to partake in this Life. Devotion to the Sacred Heart, to the Mother of God, to the Angels and Saints, Benediction, the Rosary, the giving of alms in support of missionaries in distant countries: all of these found their proper place in a busy life, in which the natural and the Supernatural were never confused but were given their due in a healthy balance. They put great trust and faith in those God had placed over them for the care of their souls and the education of their children: the Bishops, Priests, the good Nuns and Brothers. These in turn came to accept the unquestioning attitude of the good laypeople, and generally speaking were worthy of the trust placed in them.

Although maybe not an idyllic state as anything we become used to tends to 'cushion' us against crosses we do not particularly like and to resistance to changes the Holy Spirit may deem necessary for the salvation of the world - imperfections which the fine filter of Vatican II nevertheless picked up - it was the nearest thing to 'living the Faith' that the Church could expect under the circumstances. Although imperfect, we must realize and acknowledge - in the face of the subsequent monstrous derision from the teilhardians - that it was essentially good, and acknowledged as such by the Council.

Clearly wearied by 400 years of strife with Protestantism, this part of the Catholic scene prior to the Council could be summed up by the motto of the English weekly edition of the *Osservatore Romano*: "*UNICUIQUE SUUM*", "To Each his Due" (or, in effect, "To Each his Own", which is not the same), whilst it unconsciously accepted the safety and reassurance expressed in the second part of the same motto: "*NON PRAEVALEBUNT*": "They will not hold out (against us)" ... But such an obvious sigh for 'peaceful coexistence' (or 'to be left alone') in both the

spiritual and temporal order does not make for great apostles to carry out the command of the Lord “to make disciples of all the nations”. But then we must not forget that a Saint of that time, the Great Little Flower, *St. Teresa of Lisieux*, did not go out into the whole world either, yet without setting foot outside France, she became the Patron Saint of the Missions.

And so we must assume that many Catholics of this era must have done what she had done in heroic fashion: to sacrifice their daily duty for the Kingdom of God, which means that their lives still became the necessary leaven for the salvation of the world, which, as already remarked earlier, made their life-style essentially good.

This camp was not without its intellectual leaders and thinkers: philosophers, writers, theologians, seminary professors who, faithfully adhering to the anti-modernistic oath, defended the Church’s teachings against modernism as they understood it. For, in the long run, only those at the very pinnacle of the Church’s intelligentsia remained on guard both against modernism and against evolution: *Jacques Maritain*, Cardinals *Journet* and *Ottaviani*, the great *Jean Danielou*, S.J., philosophers *Dietrich von Hildebrand*, Prof. *Richard Weaver* of Chicago, *Dr. Woodbury* in Australia, and the Dutch Scripture scholar, Prof. Magister. *Dr. J.P.M. van der Ploeg*. But many others, although opposed to Modernism, did not understand the Church’s repeated warnings against Teilhardism, and so they ignored them. Thus it came about that through *teilhardian* evolution, Modernism became introduced within the Catholic fold in a *systematic* way.

If we were asked to supply the ‘trade mark’ by which this group, both the grassroots faithful and their intellectual leaders can be instantly recognized, we would have to point to their belief in the *Real Distinction* between God and His creation, between the Supernatural and the natural, and - what amounts to the same - to their belief in *Absolutes*: Absolute Truth, and an Absolute and Universal Moral Order. For such is the Tradition of the Catholic Church.

Not surprisingly, this Faith went straight through Vatican II, unchanged and unchallenged.

And what about their brothers at the other end of the great spectrum of which the pre-Conciliar Church was composed? Here, I must hand you over once again to that active, restless manipulator and shrewd observer of the world scene for the better part of 40 years: *Whittaker Chambers*, who had this to say in 1964 after his conversion from Communism:-

“I am baffled by the way people still speak of the West as if it were at least a cultural unity against Communism. But the West is divided, not only politically, but by an invisible cleavage. On one side are the voiceless masses with their own subdivisions and fractures. On the other side is the enlightened, articulate elite, which to one degree or other has

rejected the religious roots of the civilization - the roots without which it is no longer Western Civilization, but a new order of beliefs, attitudes and mandates. In short, this is the order of which Communism is one logical expression. Not originating in Russia, but in the cultural capitals of the West, reaching Russia by clandestine delivery via the old underground centres in Cracow, Vienna, Berne, Zurich and Geneva (WCC). It is a *Western* body of beliefs that now threatens the West from Russia. As a body of Western beliefs, secular, materialistic, rationalistic, the intelligentsia of the West share it, and are therefore always committed to a secret, emotional complicity with Communism” (*Cold Friday*, p. 225-6).

What is stated here so clearly is so serious, that it warrants the most careful attention, to see if it can be corroborated from other sources and evidence. In the following brief but critical analysis I will assume, that a sizeable proportion of the pre-Vatican elite referred to here, is composed of Catholics.

Now, the above quoted words of *Whittaker Chambers* can be approached in a variety of ways, but from whichever angle they are studied for their meaning, the conclusion arrived at is always the same.

1. “... elite ...which has rejected the religious roots of the civilization ...”

Catholics belonging to this elite have thus broken away from the first group mentioned in this chapter: the ones who are rooted in the tradition of the Church, drawing sustenance from it for their material and spiritual survival. The spiritual roots of the Western Civilization are not only ‘Christian’ but Catholic. Rejecting one’s spiritual roots therefore, is tantamount to saying that one is looking for, or has already adopted, a new ‘Catholic’ inspiration.

The hall-mark of the first-mentioned group by which it could be distinctly recognized was its belief in the Supernatural Order as a distinct entity, and by its belief in Absolute Truth and a universal Moral Order. This duality of belief in the Two Cities, the Two Kingdoms, carrying with it the dual obligation of rendering unto Caesar and unto God, and the Real Distinction between them, is part of God’s Revelation to Man, is part of the Deposit of Faith of the Church and has been part of the Church’s Tradition since Apostolic times.

If all this is rejected by the “elite which pulled up its religious roots from the Civilization”, then this vast group must also have adopted a new ‘philosophy’ which rejects this real distinction between the natural and the Supernatural, allowing utter confusion between the Kingdom of God and the kingdom of this world, truly once again a perfect example of that teilhardian hybrid: *a philosophy of sameness and identity*

2. “this is the (new) order of which Communism is one logical expression.”

Whoever read the papal encyclical *Divini Redemptoris* of 1937 (remember, we are dealing here with a pre-Vatican II society) knows what His Holiness Pope *Pius XI* had to say about “*this satanic scourge*”: atheistic communism. In this encyclical, the Holy Father did not mince any words:

“This Apostolic See, above all has not refrained from raising its voice, for it knows that its proper and special mission is to defend truth, justice and all those eternal values which Communism ignores or attacks. Ever since the days when groups of intellectuals were formed (Whittaker’s *elite*) in an arrogant attempt to free civilization from the bonds of morality and religion, Our Predecessors overtly and explicitly drew the attention of the world to the consequences of the *de-Christianization* of human society. With reference to Communism, Our Ven. Predecessor, *Pius IX*, of holy memory, as early as 1846 pronounced a solemn condemnation, which he confirmed in the words of the Syllabus directed against *that infamous doctrine of so-called Communism which is absolutely contrary to the Natural Law itself*, and if once adopted would utterly destroy the rights, property and possessions of all men, and even society itself” (#4).

From this teaching it is clear that, if Whittaker’s ‘Western elite’, which pulled up its ‘religious roots’, has adopted something of ‘which Communism would be a logical expression’ then this ‘new order’ they adopted must of necessity - to quote the Holy Father “be absolutely contrary to the Natural Law itself ...” Let us see if the Pope can specify this for us.

“According to the doctrine of modern Communism, there is in the world but *one* reality: matter, the *blind* forces of which *evolve* into plant, animal, man. Even human society is nothing but a phenomenon and form of matter, evolving in the same way. In such a doctrine - as is evident - there is no room for the idea of God; there is no difference between matter and spirit, between soul and body; there is neither survival of the soul after death nor any hope in a future life”. (#9).

Going by this sacred teaching, Communism rejects the *real distinction* principle, which means that anyone who rejects this principle has then in fact adopted a system, of which Communism would be a logical expression. As we will see in a few moments, there were already innumerable Catholics who even before Vatican II had rejected Thomism and its hated *real distinction* principle.

3. “As a body of Western beliefs: secular, materialistic and rationalistic, the intelligentsia of the West share it and are therefore always committed to a secret, emotional complicity with communism”.

Can anyone hope for a more succinct paraphrasing of the papal words than this resume? What did the Western intelligentsia adopt after uprooting itself from its religious past, and which was secular, materialistic and rationalistic to such an extent that Communism was not only a logical expression of this new philosophy, but which also gave the adherents of this new order a great psychological affinity to Communism?

The answer of course is *evolution*, even if the Catholic section of the Western intelligentsia tries to minimize the mental switch by stressing that theirs is *teillardian* evolution. There is no other contender on the horizon.

Let us pause for a moment and consider what we have achieved so far.

The first group of Catholics is well defined. We know it presented itself into the presence of *Vatican II* and, with suitable updating, was allowed through. But what about the second group? That they embraced teilhardian evolution, no one, not even they themselves, will deny that. And so, for this group, the crucial question was:

“Did they, in embracing teilhardism, uproot themselves from Catholic Tradition, or is teilhardism merely a legitimate interpretation of Catholicism which does not necessitate uprooting oneself from Tradition?”

We may reframe the question in a different way within the framework of the facts discovered so far:

- “Is it possible to remain in Catholic Tradition and reject the religious roots of ones Catholic civilization?”
- “Is it possible to remain in Catholic Tradition and espouse a doctrine which is diametrically opposed to it?”
- “Is it possible to reject the real distinction from a Tradition which is bound up with it, and then to believe that God can create while still evolving Himself with matter and man until ‘omega-point’ has been reached, as Teilhard postulates?”
- “Is it possible to remain rooted in Catholic Tradition eternally opposed to atheistic Communism, at the same time adopting a philosophy from which Communism would be a logical expression?”

(It is necessary to remember in this context that it was Pope *Pius XII* who wrote authoritatively in 1950 that “the false evolutionary

notions would advance the spread of Communism” (*Humani Generis*), linking the two as with an unbreakable bond. Now the 1962 *Monita* against Teilhard’s evolutionary notions have branded them as “false”, with the inevitable consequence of advancing Communism and the spread of error.)

- Finally, “Is it possible to be steeped in Catholic Tradition, and to embrace a body of Western beliefs: secular, materialistic, rationalistic, which tie the believers not only logically to Communism, but also emotionally, so that, with Communism, they become logically and emotionally opposed “*to the very Tradition which condemned Communism?*”

Since the answers to the above questions are obvious, Whittaker Chambers was right, and so were the Popes of the *Syllabus of Errors*, of *Pascendi*, of *Divini Redemptoris*, of *Humani Generis* and of the *Monita* against de Chardin. The teilhardians are no longer in Catholic Tradition, and it will be interesting to see what happened when they presented themselves, individually and as a noisy group, at the gates of *Vatican II*.

But first, what about the spread of Teilhardism? Was it far enough in 1962 to be taken into consideration?

There is plenty of evidence that the spread of Teilhard de Chardin’s ideas is worldwide and that all the great names in Catholic theology have lent their name and their prestige to the spread of his errors. With the inevitable consequence that they are now dying for a ‘church’, a ‘pope’ and a ‘council’ which will back them up. But history, common sense and Catholic Faith will teach them that it will be a ‘church’, a ‘pope’ and a ‘council’ *outside* Catholic Tradition.

“Whatever reservations one may have about the decision (to make a selection out of the *welter of teilhardian papers available*), we feel nevertheless that the selection presented in this volume has the advantage of bringing out with equal clarity both the theoretical and practical aspects of the author’s *theological thought*. In recent years much has been published about *Teilhard de Chardin’s* theological writings, both about *his theology* as a whole and about particular points in *his teaching* (see note below).

“Seldom in the history of theology has a writer’s thought been the occasion in so few years of so much, often passionate, study and discussion. The number and the quality of the studies devoted to his work in this field make it abundantly clear, how insistently Père Teilhard’s thought has captured the attention of theologians, and what an unusually powerful stimulus it is to theological speculation of our day”.

“Apart from Christological questions, most of the essays in this volume deal primarily with the *problem* (sic!) of *Original Sin*. While some of his suggestions may still seem somewhat tentatively expressed, *there can nevertheless be little doubt that it is in the direction he indicates that theological research on this issue is being pursued.*”

(Prof. N. M. Wildiers, Docteur en Théologie, in a Foreword to a book by Teilhard: *Christianity and Evolution*, French edition, 1969, English translation, Collins 1971).

This frank *Foreword* is remarkable for a number of reasons.

1. There is no indication that there ever was a *Vatican Council II*. Its existence and findings are totally ignored. Business as usual, even if the business is flagrant Modernism.
2. Teilhard’s ideas are seriously called a ‘theology’.
3. It is claimed here that his influence is unquestioned.

But Teilhard has rejected the Dogma of Original Sin as formulated and taught by the Tradition of the Church and has rejected the existence of Adam and Eve as a unique first pair. (Both his 1922 and 1947 papers on *Original Sin* are in this volume).

So, if the interest in Teilhard’s ‘theology’ is as worldwide as this man wants us to believe, and if this worldwide interest *and research* is being pursued in the direction of Teilhard’s *rejection* of the Dogma of Original Sin, then rejection and contradiction of Dogma is now - for the first time in the history of the Catholic Church - not only graced with the name ‘theology’, but is being held up as *the* theology of the Catholic Church.

This shows the rejection of the Real Distinction between Good and Evil, between Truth and its contradiction, and the adoption of the principle of *sameness* and identity, by means of which the ‘doctrine’ is being taught that evil and sin have been abolished so as to become another (and even more acceptable) form of ‘good’, and that truth *and* its contradiction and denial are equally the same. This principle is found to lie at the root of any evolutionary ‘philosophy’ in which everything: god, truth, good, evil, natural, supernatural become reduced to one evolving entity, where sin is explained away as merely being a ‘statistical mistake’ ...

4. NOTE. “His teachings”

In 1926 Teilhard’s Superiors forbade him to teach any longer. In 1947, the year of the appearance of his most ‘sophisticated’ rejection of the Dogma of *Original Sin*, this prohibition to teach was underscored and officially taken over by the highest

Authority in the Church, when *Rome* forbade him to write or teach on philosophical matters. He nevertheless continued the vigorous private circulation of his manuscripts. Here, Prof. Wildiers approves of his disobedience and recommends the fruits of it: *his teachings*, to all.

For a good treatment of the futility of teilhardian attempts at explaining away *duality* and the Real Distinction, I refer interested readers to a little booklet: *Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, Evolution and Christ*, by C. van Til, which first appeared in the May 1966 issue of *The Westminster Theological Journal*, and has been reprinted separately by the Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Box 185, Nutley 10, New Jersey.

Testimonies as to the extent of Teilhard de Chardin's acceptance in philosophical and theological circles from the thirties to the seventies and to the universality of his influence are innumerable: both in general and of individual theologians. Let me finish with one more, an observation made by a Bishop who attended the Second Vatican Council, the Most Rev. *William Adrian*, Bishop of Nashville, Tennessee. This prelate wrote a penetrating article on this very subject, entitled: *How did it happen?* from which I quote:

“The main issue at the Second Vatican Council was really that of *collegiality*, or the question of how the bishops as a body could somehow rule over the Church, the Pope holding only a Primacy of honour, *not of jurisdiction independent of the bishops.*”

Fr. Wiltgen, in his already mentioned book *The Rhine Flows into the Tiber*, supports the observation made here by Bishop Adrian. Fr. Wiltgen writes on p. 228:

“The most important and dramatic battle which took place at the Second Vatican Council was *not* the widely publicized controversy over Religious Liberty, but the one over *Collegiality*, which happened mostly behind the scenes ...”

Back to Bishop Adrian:

“The liberal bishops knew that, in order to destroy the autocratic power of the Pope and the Curia, they had to stress the idea of *rule by the bishops collectively*, and thus they could overrule the Pope. Also, such a move would overcome the embarrassing doctrine of Papal Infallibility, so inimical to non-Catholics. *But the Pope intervened* and corrected the false doctrines submitted by the bishops ... The European ‘periti’, (experts!), who really imposed their theories upon the bishops, were themselves deeply imbued with the errors of *Teilhardism* and Situation Ethics, which errors ultimately destroy all Divine Faith and Morality, and all constituted Authority. They make the person the centre and judge of all ‘truth’ and

morality irrespective of what the Church teaches ...”

But the Pope intervened and corrected ... How long will we be able to hear that happy phrase against such passive resistance, silent timidity and almost murderous ill-will?

This should do to show conclusively the existence of two distinct groups within the kaleidoscopic scene of the pre-Vatican II Catholic Church, prepared on the 11th October, 1962 to present their Catholicism to the judgement of the Church at the opening of the Second Vatican Council.

One group determined to remain within the Tradition of the Church, come what may, willing to make any corrections which their Holy Mother might deem necessary.

The other group outside the Tradition of the Church, determined to prove that, in order to survive and to be relevant to *modern man*, the Church would have to come over to their ‘inspiration’.

And in between these two clearly defined groups, the ceaseless ebb and flood of the human caravan-on-the-move, not all that much different from the times when it was viewed with the compassionate eyes of the Son of Man.

CHAPTER TWO

THE FILTER

Everybody is familiar with Our Lord's parable about the rich having difficulties getting into the Kingdom of Heaven, so much so, that it would be easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle.

The little story was bound to conjure up in the minds of His listeners the not unfamiliar sight of a rich merchant arriving after dark with his camels at the gates of Jerusalem or some other big city, only to find them closed. Provision was made for such an eventuality in that a traveller could present himself *at the needle's eye*, a little opening in the wall, where he was expected to dismount, unload his beast of burden and pass his possessions through the needle's eye to the guard at the other end. After all that he could, if he could manage it, try to get his camel through the narrow opening as well.

If in times of war or other great upheavals, it was considered necessary to close the gates, the procedure at the needle's eye had the additional advantage of providing the guards with the necessary facilities of checking each caller's intentions and bona fides as a traveller or a citizen, by means of a minute inspection of baggage and credentials. If from whatever was presented for inspection some, or most, or even all was refused entry, the caller could either chose to stay outside the wall with his rejected belongings, or else leave them behind and proceed to join his family and friends inside.

There was, however, a third possibility. He could *bypass* procedures and try to force his way in by illegal entry. But then, according to the words of Our Lord as recorded in John 10:1, it is legitimate to consider him a thief and a brigand. (It is important to keep this in mind!).

If these are legitimate associations which Our Lord wanted attached to the parable of the needle's eye, then it is not unreasonable to conclude that His Sacred teaching extends to cover any inordinate attachment, not only to riches and material possessions, but also to erroneous opinions, prejudices and bad intentions.

In conclusion of this little digression on a familiar theme, I wish to point out that neither the parable nor the proceedings at the needle's eye were meant to be a tribunal, sitting in judgement over personal guilt or innocence. People were free to either pass through the narrow opening, leaving, if necessary, their property behind if it was impossible to bring in or had been refused entry; or refuse to come in, preferring to stay outside with their belongings.

Neither did *Vatican II* sit in judgement on anybody; but, inexorably, it did bring to the surface unacceptable cargo: erroneous opinions and yes, even bad intentions. On each occasion bringing out, in greater clarity, the proper teaching of the Catholic

Church on these matters.

A Tradition itself

There is no doubt that the Sacred Tradition of the Catholic Church passed through *Vatican II* with flying colours. The Council goes out of its way in its actual wording to firmly base itself on this Tradition; and in innumerable references, both to the earliest documents of the Church and to encyclicals of later Popes as well as to the decisions of other Ecumenical Councils, *Vatican II* provides us with a rich panorama of its own orthodoxy.

This puts a grave obligation on anyone, not only to accept the Council's declared decision and intention to stay wholly within the Sacred Tradition of the Catholic Church, but also to explain its teaching in the Light of that Tradition.

From the many places in the conciliar documents, where the Council either bases itself explicitly on the teaching of Traditions or declares that its own teaching is in line with this sacred Tradition, we have room here only for a few examples. Then, encouraged by such expressions of genuine orthodoxy, the reader can easily augment the score by a careful reading of the conciliar text.

1. "When we celebrate the Eucharistic Sacrifice we are most closely united to the worship of the heavenly Church, when in the fellowship of communion we honor and remember the glorious Mary ever Virgin, St. Joseph, the holy Apostles and Martyrs and all the Saints. This Sacred Council accepts loyally the venerable Faith of our ancestors in the living communion which exists between us and our brothers who are in the glory of heaven or who are yet to be purified after their death; and it proposes again the *Decrees of the Second Council of Nicea* (A.D. 600), of the *Council of Florence* (1304) and of the *Council of Trent* (1580) ... On the other hand, let the faithful be taught that our communion with these in heaven, provided that it is understood in the full Light of Faith, in no way diminishes the worship of adoration given to God the Father, through Christ in the Spirit: on the contrary, it greatly enriches it."
(*Dogmatic Constitution On the Church*, #50, #51).
2. "Following then in the steps of the Councils of Trent and Vatican I, this Synod wishes to set forth the true doctrine on Divine Revelation and its transmission. For it wants the whole world to hear the summons to Salvation so that through hearing it may believe, through belief it may hope, and through hope it may come to love (St. Augustine) ... *And Tradition transmits in its entirety* the Word of God which has been entrusted to the Apostles by Christ the Lord and the Holy Spirit. It transmits it to the successors of the Apostles so that, enlightened by the

Spirit of Truth, they may faithfully preserve, expound and spread it abroad by their preaching. Thus it comes about that the Church does not draw Her certainty about all Revealed Truths from the Holy Scriptures alone. Hence *both Scripture and Tradition* must be accepted and honoured with *equal* feelings of devotion and reverence” (Council of Trent).

(*Dogmatic Constitution On Divine Revelation*, #1, #9.)

3. “In order to satisfy the divine command: ‘Make disciples of all the nations’, (Mt. 28:19), the Catholic Church must spare no effort in striving ‘that the Word of the Lord may speed on and triumph’ (2 Thess. 3:1). The Church therefore earnestly urges Her children first of all that ‘supplications, prayers, intercessions and thanks-givings be made for all men ... This is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who desires all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the Truth’ (1 Tim. 1:4). *However, in forming their consciences the faithful must pay careful attention to the sacred and certain teaching of the Church. For the Catholic Church is by the Will of God the teacher of Truth.* It is Her duty to proclaim and teach with authority the Truth which is Christ, and at the same time, to declare and confirm *by Her authority* the principles of the moral order which spring from human nature itself. In addition, Christians should approach those who are outside, wisely ‘in the Holy Spirit, genuine love, truthful speech’ (2 Cor. 6:6-7), and should strive, even to the shedding of their blood, to spread the Light of Life with all confidence and apostolic courage. The disciple has a grave obligation to Christ, his Master, to grow daily in his knowledge of the Truth he has received from Him, to be faithful in announcing it and vigorous in defending it, without having recourse to methods which are contrary to the spirit of the Gospel.”

(*Declaration On Religious Liberty* #14).

4. “Nevertheless, our separated brethren, whether considered individually or as communities and churches, are not blessed with that unity which Jesus Christ wished to bestow on all those to whom He has given new birth into one body, and whom He has quickened to newness of life - that unity, which the Holy Scriptures *and the Ancient Tradition of the Church* proclaim. For it is through Christ’s Catholic Church *alone*, which is the *universal help towards salvation* that the fullness of the means of salvation can be obtained. It was to the Apostolic College alone, of which Peter is the head, that we believe that Our Lord entrusted all the blessings of the New Covenant, in order to establish on earth the One Body of Christ into which all those should be fully incorporated who belong in any way to the people of God.”

(*Decree On Ecumenism*, #3)

From these, and many other quotations like these, it must become patently clear that, whenever the Council is breaking new ground (Religious Liberty, Ecumenism), she nevertheless is at pains not only to draw inspiration from Tradition, but also to declare that, what is being taught, is truly Catholic. The Modernists, teilhardians and marxist Catholics will not have a bar of this; that is why, in their utter disappointment with *Vatican II*, they are increasingly turning their attention to means of controlling the government of the Church so they can direct the Church to “Vatican III”.

B Teaching Considered Traditional.

There is a subtle difference between the official traditional teaching of the Magisterium and the way it was allowed to grow and become accepted and put into practice by Catholics of a given period. We are dealing here with opinions and beliefs which had grown over Tradition and the Deposit of Faith so that they became considered and accepted as part thereof. It is obvious that in this area the Church from time to time must take stock and bring in the necessary corrections.

For example, the watchfulness of the Church in the days of *St. Paul* against any contamination of Jewish teaching on the purity of the Gospel, the watchfulness of the same Church in the days of the Reformation against reformed inroads into Catholicism, and the watchfulness of the Church of our times against corruption through modernism and Communism could *in practice* be lived by Catholics in a state of animosity against those offending people, which would offend the Universal Law of charity.

The way the Faith is sometimes lived in practice shows how a particular opinion about the implementation of the Faith has grown up, and this may need corrections, not only of the practice itself, but also of the opinion about the manner of implementation. And so we have:

- (1) The Catholic Faith;
- (2) The authentic Magisterium’s teaching about the Faith;
- (3) The practice of the Faith;
- (4) An opinion about the practice of the Faith.

In the hurly-burly of everyday life, (2) and (4) sometimes get mixed up, and when pre-Vatican II Catholic Life came before the Bar of *Vatican II*, our Holy Mother the Church acknowledged the essential, *traditional* goodness and truth thereof, but was nevertheless forced to bring in many corrections. And that was not always appreciated or even accepted.

For example, the Church *teaches* that Catholic Faith and Protestant Faith are not the same.

In practice we stay away from each other’s services.

Opinion about this practice: it is a good thing that we stay away from each other's services. This opinion became accepted as inviolate.

Vatican II sounded a warning and gave a new directive.

Archbishop Lefebvre's reaction: "They have changed the Faith! This goes against Tradition ..."

Teilhardian/modernist reaction: "Thank God they have changed the Faith! After all, all faith is the same ..."

Needless to say, neither reaction is right. But if these are the only claims the good Catholics hear, then it is small wonder that their enthusiasm for *Vatican II* is dampened. Since *Vatican II* was a Pastoral Council, it was mainly in this area of erroneous opinions about the practice of the Faith that most of the sifting out of otherwise very orthodox Catholics had to be done, and where Catholics were reminded that the fate of the non-Catholics was very much their concern and that this concern demanded the acceptance of the Cross: the Cross of a renewed effort at apostleship.

And it was precisely in *this* area that people like Archbishop *Marcel Lefebvre* refused to give up their 'belongings' and preferred to stay with them outside the walls ... It is no good him claiming he was asked to give up *essentials* to the Faith. *Vatican II* did nothing of the kind: we all needed training for a tough time ahead, and at times that is not very pleasant. But those of us who did respond, and accepted the discipline and the corrections, very soon started to feel the benefits of true renewal and to obtain the fruits the Church wanted us Catholics to receive from a filial acceptance of the Spirit of the Council. We will return to this in the final chapter of this paper.

Meanwhile, what were some of the 'untouchables' *Vatican II* held up against the Light, and from which it sifted out what, in that very Light, it considered in need of correction?

(a) The Liturgy.

Few of us would have expected that this would have been the very first area where the Council deemed reform necessary. Yet, from the deep-seated revolt that has risen in some quarters of the Church against the Council decisions in reforming the Liturgy, it has come to light that erroneous opinions had become established *around* the Latin Liturgy which stood in need of correction. I have dealt in more detail with these matters in a previous paper: *In Defence of the Novus Ordo Missae of His Holiness Pope Paul VI* in which I showed that objections to the Novus Ordo Missae raised from *history, Tradition, theology* and *Faith* were inadmissible in the Light of True Faith, and only managed to show up the defects in the objectors.

Some may still maintain that the *Novus Ordo* did not come from *Vatican II*, but the late Holy Father Pope *Paul VI* has effectively blocked the path of this reasoning on numerous occasions. In this and the following, we are here not dealing with the intentions some Council Fathers may have had in introducing, supporting or rejecting the rich material brought out for discussion, but with the effect these deliberations and decisions had on the Faithful. Or at least were meant to have had.

(b) The Nature of the Catholic Church.

For 1900 years the Church has taught authoritatively (including through *Vatican II*) and the faithful have always believed that the Catholic Church is absolutely necessary for salvation. And so we came to expect that this Council would have stated "... that the Church Christ founded *EXISTS* in the Catholic Church ...". However, the Council, in dealing with this very question, used the word *SUBSISTS*:

"This Church, constituted and organised in the world as a society, *subsists* in the Catholic Church, which is governed by the successor of Peter and by the bishops in union with that successor" (*Lumen Gentium* #8).

This is a fortuitous choice of words. If the Council had chosen the word "exists", it would then be natural to assume that the Council was teaching that the Catholic Church *extends as far as it exists: in the visible society of Catholics here on earth*. And once again the burning question 'to whom do the elements of grace and truth and holiness belong found outside Her' would still not have been resolved. But 'subsists' means more than 'exists', and by using the word 'subsists' the Council can now claim what in fact She did claim, that:

"the many elements of sanctification and of Truth ... found outside Her visible structure, as gifts properly belonging to the Church of Christ, possess an inner dynamism to **Catholic** unity."

This is profound. The Council abstains from telling us what all the Modernists have been at pains to tell us ad nauseam, that it is now conciliar teaching, that the bearers of these elements of holiness and truth are *members* of the Catholic Church. But the Council *did* tell us that the possessors of these elements of holiness and truth can thank the Catholic Church of Christ for their existence. The Catholic Church, whilst *subsisting* in the visible society of Catholics, *extends* invisibly further to give to non-Catholics the elements of truth and holiness they may possess, without making the possessors of these elements members.

And so, the Catholic Church is *essential* for non-Catholics so they can possess the graces necessary for salvation. The Modernists have pounced on this word 'subsists' to claim that the Council has shifted ground on the age-old teaching of the Church so that it now means to include non-Catholics as members. But the conciliar teaching is much more profound than that, and going by the choice of wording used

in the text it is obvious that the Council has taught us with much greater clarity *where* the Catholic Church can be *seen to subsist*, and how far She *invisibly extends*.

(c) On True Ecumenism and Religious Liberty.

Two further areas of worry for orthodox Catholics can be found in the conciliar teaching on *Ecumenism* and *Religious Liberty*. Mainly because of the false claims made by the Modernists concerning this conciliar teaching. That is why earlier in this paper I have gone to the trouble of quoting words taken from these two Decrees of Vatican II, words which recommend themselves for their orthodoxy and which are the foundation of the teachings to follow.

At present time it is virtually impossible to find out where *in practice* the *true* ecumenism envisaged and taught by *Vatican II* can be found, since so much of what *Vatican II* rejected in this area is being proposed as coming from this Council. And the same goes for *true* Religious Liberty: Catholics claiming for themselves a *freedom of conscience* which is tantamount to rejecting Catholic Faith in favour of an imaginary new-found 'freedom'. But not all the trouble comes from the false claims made in these areas: much of it stems from erroneous convictions adopted by pre-conciliar Catholics who used the safety of their ignorance as a pretext and excuse for aloofness and inaction.

To be reminded of one's ecumenical obligations is painful, and the use made everywhere of the false ecumenism and the bogus 'freedom of conscience' by the teilhardians, marxists and Modernists must not deter us to put into practice what *Vatican II* taught us with authority and truthfulness in these matters.

These few examples must suffice to show us that, irrespective of rampant falsehoods made available everywhere to warp the impact of *Vatican II*, which may have frightened off orthodox Catholics, these Catholics are thereby not excused from looking into themselves to see if there is something within themselves which *Vatican II* sifted out but which they refuse to give up, and which is the real reason why they allow a mistrust of the Council to continue in their lives. For if this is the case, then they miss out on enormous graces which the Cross of *Vatican II* was meant to unleash in their lives and in the lives of the souls entrusted to their care ...

C Teilhardian Modernism.

If we can be sure of one thing, it is that *Teilhardian Modernism and Evolution* got blocked by the Sacred Council in no uncertain way. Nothing of this was allowed through. It is absolutely impossible to maintain that, even if force was used on the text, the sacred documents refer - however remotely - to an evolutionary spirit. Everything is solid, traditional language. The examples one can choose are myriad:

1. “For it is the Liturgy through which, especially in the Divine Sacrifice of the Eucharist ‘the work of our redemption is accomplished’ (Hebr. 13:14), and it is through the Liturgy especially that the faithful are enabled to express in their lives and manifest to others the mystery of Christ and the real nature of the true Church. The Church is essentially both human and divine, visible but endowed with invisible realities ... so constituted that in Her the human is directed toward and subordinated to the Divine, the visible to the invisible ...”

This clearly establishes, from the opening paragraph of the First Document promulgated: *The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, the traditional acceptance of the Real Distinction between the natural and the supernatural rejected by the teilhardians. The Council accepts Sacrifice, Redemption, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, all unacceptable to the reigning Modernists as well as being unobtainable by mere human efforts, (such as ‘belief’ in evolution).

2. “God Who wills that all men be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth, (1. Tim. 2:4) ... when the fulness of time had come, sent His Son, the Word made flesh, anointed by the Holy Spirit, to preach the Gospel to the poor, to heal the contrite of heart, to be a bodily and spiritual medicine: the Mediator between God and man. For His Humanity, united with the Person of the Word, was the instrument of our salvation. In Christ the perfect achievement of our reconciliation came forth and the fulness of Divine Worship was given to us” (Liturgy 5).

No trace of modernism or evolution here: Real Distinction between God and man taught, divinity of Christ acclaimed, the fact that Christ was and is a Divine Person stressed, etc.

3. “Before men can come to the liturgy, they must be called to Faith and to conversion ... So the Church announces the good tidings of salvation to those who do not believe so that all men may come to the knowledge of the one true God, and Jesus Christ Whom He has sent and may be converted from their ways, doing penance” (Liturgy 9).

No ‘inter-communion’ here. ‘Penance’ is not admitted in an evolutionary system, since in such a system *sin* does not exist, only mistakes.

4. “To believers also the Church must ever preach Faith and Penance; She must prepare them for the Sacraments ... thus making it clear that Christ’s faithful, *though not of this world*, are to be the lights of the world and are to glorify the Father before men” (Liturgy 9).

In an evolutionary system, the faithful would be part of the evolving world like

everybody else.

5. “From the Liturgy, therefore, and especially from the Eucharist, *Grace* is poured forth upon us as from a fountain ...”

A Church which still holds fast to the teaching of the existence of ‘grace’ as something ‘that flows from a fountain’ is certainly not a Church that is inspired by modernism and ‘evolution’.

6. “The *Catholic Church* was founded by Christ Our Lord to bring salvation to all men ... The second question bears on the relation between the rights of art - to use a current expression - and the moral law. The controversies to which this problem increasingly gives rise frequently trace their origin to an erroneous understanding either of ethics or of aesthetics. The Council proclaims that all must accept *the Absolute Primacy of the Objective Moral Order*. It alone is superior to, and is capable of harmonizing, all forms of human activity, not excepting art, no matter how noble in themselves. Only the Moral Order touches Man in the totality of his being as God’s rational creature, called to a Supernatural Destiny. If the moral order is fully and faithfully observed, it leads man to full perfection and happiness”

(*Decree on Social Communications*, #3,#6).

So the Council still believes in, and teaches the existence of, *absolutes*: an absolute moral order of Supernatural origin, coming from outside man i.e. from man’s Creator, and which is written in his totality as creature, as a rational creature. With this clear teaching, the Council unequivocally rejects *situation ethics* and the *primacy of a subjective moral code* as is taught by Kohlberg and innumerable ‘catholic’ moralists.

7. “Deep within his conscience man discovers a law *which he has not laid upon himself but which he must obey ... For man has in his heart a law inscribed by God*. His dignity lies in observing this law, and by it he will be judged ... Since human freedom has been weakened by *sin*, it is only by the help of God’s *grace* that man can give his actions their full and proper relationship to God”

(*Church in the Modern World*, #16, #17).

So the Council sticks to her teaching about obedience to a transcending, absolute and universal moral law, written by God in man’s heart, and that God’s grace is needed to keep that law.

8. “Although set by God in a state of rectitude, man, enticed by the Evil One, abused his freedom at the very start of history. He lifted himself against God and sought to attain his goal apart from Him”

(Church in the Modern World, #13).

9. “At that moment (i.e. of the Church’s glorious completion), as the Fathers put it, all the just from the time of Adam, ‘from Abel, the just one, to the last of the elect’ (*St. Gregory the Great, St. Augustine, St. John Damascene*), will be gathered together, with the Father, in the Universal Church”

(Lumen Gentium, #2).

10. “In reality it is only in the mystery of the Word made flesh that the mystery of man truly becomes clear. For Adam, the first man, was a type of Him Who was to come, Christ the Lord, Christ the new Adam ... He Who is ‘the image of the invisible God’, is Himself the perfect Man who has restored in the children of Adam that likeness to God which had been disfigured ever since the first sin”

(Church in the Modern World, #22).

These last three are the final blow to evolution, teilhardism and modernism: this sustained and orthodox teaching on *Original Sin* and *our First Parents*.

This must do to show by overwhelming evidence that, no matter where one opens the Conciliar documents, one will always find authentic teaching of the Catholic Church of Tradition and the total absence of any trace of teilhardian evolution: neo- and systematic modernism. Whatever was brought into the Council tainted by evolution and modernism was ruthlessly sifted out and rejected.

This means that, if the post-Conciliar Church became saturated with the heresies of Modernism, they did not come from this Council nor from the Catholic Church. The harbingers of these evils forced their way into the sheepfold, not through the Gate, but through some other way. (John 10:1).

CHAPTER THREE

THE BYPASS.

In *Chapter One* we were made aware of the existence of a massive body of Western elite, which had adopted a philosophy of which Communism is one logical expression.

We accepted the fact that this body of the “new order intellectuals” of necessity contained a very large slice of Catholic intelligentsia since it is made up of people who have uprooted themselves from the Catholic Tradition which lies at the foundation of the European Civilization.

A study of the *philosophy* of this “new order” and of the “*Nouvelle Théologie*” of Prof. N. M. Wildiers confirms our strong suspicion that, inevitably, it has, as its chief characteristic, Teilhard’s evolutionary principle of *Sameness and Identity* since it broke away from the age-old Catholic Philosophy which, even long before *St. Thomas Aquinas*, had as its foundation principle the *Real Distinction* between God and Creation and between matter and spirit.

But it was not until His Holiness Pope *Pius XI* illuminated our natural understanding of these things with the supernatural insights of Faith, when, in his celebrated encyclical against Atheistic Communism, he taught us with the force of the highest teaching authority in the Church *that Communism is absolutely contrary to the Natural Law itself and that it is rooted in evolution which abolishes the real distinction between God and matter, between the Creator and the creature, between the natural and the Supernatural*. Therefore, whoever accepts a *new order* and a *new philosophy of which Communism is a logical expression and a psychological and emotional ‘blood brother’*, must have embraced a philosophy absolutely contrary to Natural Law itself and which must be rooted in evolution for Communism to be able to be a logical and emotional expression of it.

We do know that the Western Catholic intelligentsia *has* adopted a *philosophy of evolution*: Teilhardism, which *has* rejected Thomism and the Real Distinction principle, and which *does have* as its starting point the totally inadmissible principle of identity and sameness of everything in the one plane: evolution.

(Cf. Teilhard de Chardin in all his works, but especially in his 1922 paper against Original Sin, his 1929 paper *The Human Sense*, his books *The Phenomenon of Man* and *The divine Milieu* and in his 1947 paper, his third against Original Sin).

We further know that this philosophy, and the “*Nouvelle Théologie*” (Dutch ‘catechism’!) to which it gave birth, were forcefully and persistently presented at the Second Vatican Council ‘as genuine expressions of Catholicism’ only to be equally forcefully and persistently filtered out and rejected through the direct protection by

the Holy Spirit.

As we saw, there is not a trace of Modernism or evolution in any Council document, notwithstanding the totally misleading picture painted by people like *Michael Davies* who in his infamous book *Pope John's Council* contrives to 'prove' his erroneous preconceived idea that, since there was a marked influence of *the Rhine* at the Council, it had to prevail ... The Holy Spirit only used the miserable attempts by the 'Rhine' group to shape the Cross necessary for the purification and correction of orthodox Catholics, but not for the formulation of doctrine contrary to Traditional Teaching.

And since Michael Davies and his group of 'Tridentiners' reject this Cross in preference to the sterile suffering of disobedience and schism, they reject the Council which offered this Cross in Name of Our Holy Mother the Church for the salvation of the world.

They have rejected this Cross and this Sacred Council at their peril. For with their action they have also rejected the Supernatural Light so necessary to make this Cross meaningful. And they have led thousands astray with their endless prattle at the base of the *Towering Rock of Peter*, which they have now declared and pointed out *as a shipping hazard* to the delight of the Modernists. For what more could the Modernists hope for than that, at the very time of the most concentrated attack on the foundations of the Catholic Church and the Papacy, the so-called 'injustices', which the Tridentiners imagine have been meted out to them, have made ordinary Catholics silent and sullen in the defence of the Council and the Papacy, because of the totally mistaken idea that these devilish attacks could come from the Church Herself, a church-gone-wrong.

Theirs is a defamation of the Majesty of God, which they will come to regret. At the very moment that the Catholic Church is fighting the battle of Her life for Her credibility and even for Her visible presence amongst us, these people believe and preach that, at the most crucial moment of the Catholic Church's long history, God gave to His Church a Council which is so unsure and unsound that it is to be ignored and rejected. And gave us a Holy Father Pope *Paul VI* 'heretical enough' to implement these unsure and unsound teachings of the Council. *Perish the thought ...!*

What, then, is at stake?

At stake is the credibility and the visible presence of the Catholic Church amongst us here on earth. Ever since the Sacred Council, the Modernists and Marxists have ravaged our Holy Mother the Catholic Church and torn Her apart. Their philosophy and theology, their evolution and heresies were thrown out by the Church in *Vatican II* in no uncertain manner. That should have been the end of the story. That it is *not* shows that, in their absolute determination to destroy every

vestige of the Catholic Church, *A BYPASS HAD TO BE FOUND*.

And found it was ...

What, then, is this fools-gold of tantalising beauty which is considered so valuable that our modernistic Catholic elite and intelligentsia has sold everything, including its intellectual honesty and even its birthright to Everlasting Life in order to possess it? In the colossal pretence that, through them, the Holy Church is now in bondage to acknowledge the value of their mesmerising ‘vision’?

What is considered so important for the introduction into the Catholic fold, that, even after its ignominious rejection at the Council, *a detour simply had to be found* in order to introduce it at all cost? To *force* it on us?

Is it evolution?

No it is not. Nobody believes in evolution. Teilhardian evolution is absurd. But it is the only syringe that contains the deadly poison, the lethal *drug* ... After the injection, the empty syringe is useless and is discarded ...

Is it Existentialism?

No, it is not. Existentialism is only a system of thought to give bogus existences to things that do not exist, preventing a serious study of the nature of the contraband. But here again, although, useless in itself, existentialism is nevertheless *indispensable as a mask* and a *wrapping* to hide the murderous face of the one that holds the deadly weapon ...

No, the solution to solving the riddle of what is driving our Modernists will have to be found in something far more mundane and down-to-earth. In something that is lure enough to make people subordinate everything else to it in their unholy quest for its acquisition.

What did *Bishop William Adrian* of Nashville, Tennessee, say was the *main* issue at the Second Vatican Council? Did he not say:

“The main issue at the Second Vatican Council was really that of *collegiality*, or the question of how the bishops as a body could somehow rule over the Church, the Pope holding only a Primacy of honour, *not of jurisdiction independent of the bishops?*”

And did *Fr. Wiltgen* in his book *The Rhine flows into the Tiber* not agree with him in these words:

“The most important and dramatic battle which took place at the Second

Vatican Council was *not* the widely publicized controversy over Religious Liberty, but the one over *Collegiality*, which happened mostly behind the scenes ...”

Thus the name of the game is **POWER**. Hunger for *Power to Control* ...

But naked aggression too early displayed is resisted and squashed. It is better to use something that is subtle but eminently effective, something that can even make people excited enough to make this power-to-control seem necessary, so it becomes acceptable without unnecessary violence. Not before it becomes *popular* to persecute. And when will that be?

According to the American sociologist *H. Blumer* (“Collective Behavior” in *Principles of Sociology*, A. M. Lee edition, New York, 1951, pp. 165-222), **four** fundamental factors are important for the success of a new, social movement:

First, a **general uneasiness** in which men are responsive to a new appeal;

Second, a **popular rising**, in which all are agreed as to the sources of the difficulty and in which the goals of the movement are clearly defined;

Third, **indoctrination**, i.e. the creation of a body of dogmas and a vanguard of adherents to disseminate them; and

Fourth, **institutionalization** which is necessary in order to realize the goals of the movement.

We could not wish for a better *birth certificate* of the forth-coming One-World ‘Church’ predicted and foreseen by His Holiness Pope *St. Pius X* already in 1910.

- *EVOLUTION* has created a world-wide *uneasiness* with regard to Christianity and especially with regard to the Catholic Church in Her prohibitions against Teilhard de Chardin.
- *ECUMENISM* has become *the popular uprising* in which all are asked to agree that “the old Church” is the source of the difficulty. The Catholic Church with Her claim to uniqueness has kept us all divided.
- *MODERNISM* with its ‘group dynamics’, ‘sensitivity training’ and ‘audacity’, is meant to release the pent-up feelings of frustration and will consolidate these vague notions into “*dogmas of reasonableness*” by indoctrination, by which Catholics who refuse to go along with it can be singled out as queer,

unreasonable splitters; and finally the new,

- *ONE-WORLD CHURCH* of Ecumenism and Unity will *institutionalize* it all on a world wide scale in the name of the World Council of Churches and the Holy Spirit ...

Only then will it be popular to persecute, in the name of world unity and in the name of the Holy Spirit, all those who will not conform and refuse admission.

With such global power at stake, the Modernists simply could not accept the defeat received in the Second Vatican Council. For they knew that *underneath* evolution and existentialism, and *inside* the syringe and the masquerading wrapping, lies hidden the *one ingredient vital to the success of their whole power struggle and global conquest*:

“The Philosophy of Sameness”, the “Principle of Identity” ...

For the success of the whole movement it is imperative that millions of lukewarm, materialistic, browned-off Catholics make their entry into the new, man-made *Church of Darkness* to create the illusion that the Catholic Church Herself has entered under their powerful guidance.

For this to happen the false ecumenism is absolutely essential since it possesses the *one* ingredient necessary for success: this Principle of Sameness. Divisions in Christianity are only apparent: deep down, all Christians are the same ... Global unification requests as a necessary prerequisite: *pluralism in doctrine* (“it is all the same what you believe”), which in turn requires the abolition of Catholic Dogma (e.g. the Assumption), since it is precisely this *pluralism-in-doctrine* which gives the illusion of “sameness for all”. It is all the same if you believe in Mary’s Assumption or not; your beliefs are your personal affair as long as you do not believe in absolutes: Absolute Truth and an Absolute Moral Code.

For global unification also demands *pluralism-in-morality*, so morality can become adaptable to situations which is incompatible with an absolute moral code: the Ten Commandments. It is all the same, really, if you practise abortion or not, as long as you do not declare anything absolute except *relativity in morals*.

This principle of sameness and identity between the natural and the supernatural, between ‘relative’ and ‘absolute’ does, of course, not exist: it has only the appearance, the illusion, of existence: a veritable *existentialist* existence. But it has been laid at the root and heart of Modernism so much so, that **no Modernist**, be he Hans Kung, Karl Rahner, Fr. Arnold Hogan or Sr. Peter Traviss; no architect of the “Church of Darkness”, no agent of the false ecumenism, can open his or her mouth, *however cautiously*, without being instantly recognised by it. And this by the

saving Will of God, Who is asking a veritable Cross from His followers at the present time, **but not deception ...**

This ‘philosophy of sameness and identity’ is the fundamental and eternal enemy of the Real Distinction, and here, at the core of the battle for the safeguarding of the Real Distinction, the Catholics have their most Powerful Ally: *Transubstantiation*, or Christ Himself in the Blessed Eucharist. For here, *the Real Distinction comes to Life*; here it is Lived; here it becomes elevated to Dogma: eternally true, the Word of God Himself. What was bread *before* the Consecration ceases to be bread *after* it, and a totally new Substance, totally and Really Distinct from the substance of bread, takes its place: the Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

No wonder, then, that the fury of Hell on earth: Modernism, has raised its greatest howl and outcry against this most sacred Dogma of the Catholic Church. For if **this** Real Distinction is allowed to remain, **all** real distinctions are saved and kept in place, and the ‘philosophy of sameness’ is doomed.

In one of the worst books ever printed in defence of Modernism: *What are the theologians saying?*, in which the compiler, one Monika Hellwig, allows Satan to spew his venom over the sacred teaching of the Church, the Dogma of Transubstantiation is mercilessly attacked in hatred:

“The Pope’s personal judgement was that for most adult Catholics today the full spiritual meaning of the Eucharist is carried in the word transubstantiation. Many theologians hope (because the word is still so offensive to devout Protestant Christians, and because younger Catholics are quite confused by it) that one day it will slide out of the official formulations into history, along with transfiguration and transformation, as just one way of describing an elusive and many-faceted mystery”.

After having attacked the teaching of Pope Paul VI in his jewel *Mystery of Faith* with all the lies and cunning she is capable of, this is the final summing up: “Pope Paul’s personal judgement”! After the Pontiff had gone out of his way to put before us *infallible teaching* held by the Catholic Church throughout the ages, and had become the *third* Pope in history to declare *Transubstantiation* a Dogma of the Church, as such defined by the *Council of Trent*.

“*Sliding into history and oblivion ...*” against the solemn teaching of this same Pontiff in #9 of the same encyclical:

“Indeed we are aware of the fact that, among those who deal with this Most Holy Mystery in written or spoken word, there are some who with reference to the *Dogma of Transubstantiation* spread abroad opinions which disturb the faithful and fill their minds with no little confusion about matters of Faith. It is as if every one were permitted *to consign to*

oblivion doctrine already *defined* by the Church, or else interpret it in such a way as to weaken the genuine meaning of the words or the recognised force of the concepts involved”.

On the testimony of the Holy Father here, if the theologians are really saying what Hellwig tells us they are saying (and there is plenty of evidence in support of Hellwig’s claims), then what the Modernists are talking about is how to abort our Catholic Faith, and it is obvious that such attempts and such teaching can only come into the sheepfold by devious means: *by a detour bypassing Vatican II*. [Karl Rahner gets pride of place in Hellwig’s book; his thoughts and teachings are expressed in 5 out of the 10 essays. In one of them, on ‘grace’, he is bracketed with ‘theologian’ Teilhard de Chardin].

“The Gospel of the Church of Darkness” as expressed in books like *What are the theologians saying?* and *Toward Vatican III* is loud and clear: “See for yourself how reasonable the philosophy of sameness is, how reasonable our solutions are, against the unreasonableness of Catholic Dogma and the Real Distinction!” And against this, all that our good Catholics have to do is to renew their Supernatural, Infused, Divine and Catholic Faith in Transubstantiation: *the Dogma that has canonized the Real Distinction. ...*

CHAPTER FOUR

“... FOR WIDE IS THE ROAD THAT LEADS TO PERDITION, AND MANY TAKE IT ...”

[Matt. 7:23]

Now that we are convinced of the *fact* and the *reasons* why it is ‘full speed ahead’ for the Modernists after *Vatican II*, it would be very instructive to draw the attention of the reader to some very interesting bits and pieces of information, which reveal the existence of a detour: a network of channels and pipelines used by the religious leaders of the world to bypass the Magisterium of the Catholic Church, at the same time that they attempt to involve the Church with the trafficking along the doctrinal drug trails, unceasingly preparing for the day when the “*doctrine*” of their own making will be taught by a “*church*” of their own making, approved by a “*pope*” of their own making, one that may look like the Lamb but speaks like the Dragon (Apoc. 13:11).

Some of this evidence clearly points to conclusions reached or decisions taken prior to, or at the latest concurrent with, the Second Vatican Council. This means that neither these decisions and conclusions nor the ‘teachings’ they contain can in any way be traced to the ‘inspiration’ and ‘insights’ of *Vatican II*. A few examples will be helpful.

1. It may all be very ecumenical and ‘Christ-like’ of His Grace, Archbishop Frank Little of Melbourne, Australia, to ask for, and obtain, from his Senate of Priests permission to join the Victorian branch of the World Council of Churches, but what follows has been officially stated in reports from a WCC organised World Conference, *The Eighth Conference on World Missions* in Bangkok, 1973.

In 1974 there appeared on the world scene an English translation of an incredible German book, written by a Lutheran Doctor in Theology, which book dispelled any doubts many may still have about the ‘religious’ future of the world. The title of the book is *Bangkok 73*, and its author is Prof. Peter Beyerhaus. If anyone still needs convincing that Modernism is conceived in Hell, this book will achieve that.

Prof. Beyerhaus is one of that rare breed of international theologians still wholly uncontaminated by Modernism, and his book *Bangkok 73* is an eyewitness account of what actually took place before *and* at the 8th Conference on World Mission, held at Bangkok in 1973, under the auspices of the World Council of Churches. The title of this World Conference on Missions was - significantly enough - “*Salvation Today*”.

In his book Prof. Beyerhaus explains to us the unbelievable but *total* contradiction that took place at the Conference: how 326 serious, mission-minded delegates can come together to study the *advance* of global missionary activity, and can come out with the exact opposite: calling for a *halt*, a *moratorium* on missionary activity, **thinking that they were still the same people, and that they were doing God and the missions a good turn ..!**

In this contradiction lies the most accurate description one could ever hope to give of Modernism and all its off-shoots, expressing in its brevity the most fundamental objection the Holy Church could ever have against it.

Prof. Beyerhaus meets the issue head-on. “*The true key*”, he says “*to the planning of the course and to the full understanding of the Bangkok Conference itself lies in the professed ‘equation’ between a systematically staged socio-psychological experiment (i.e. group-dynamics: ‘brainwashing’) and the action of the Holy Spirit*”.

And the professor then sets out to show from every angle and with a welter of detail how this perversion “*of equating brainwashing with the Holy Spirit*” was carried out. Nothing was left to chance! Even the objection that such an exercise is impossible is squarely met. The poor delegates did not have a chance from the word go. Why? ***because they became involved!***

And judging by the innumerable Catholics who now believe the opposite of what the Church taught us before, who no longer can tell the difference between Catholic Faith and any other faith, and who think that “being on the pill” and accepting Church teaching can go together: the experiment did not stop at Bangkok, but has swept the world.

In describing all the aspects of how the basic rules of brainwashing were applied at Bangkok, Prof. Beyerhaus lays bare *the* most crucial, central brand-mark of Modernism, stamped on it by the inventors of the ‘philosophy of sameness’ “*the complete mutual openness, so that people can expose their vulnerability **without questioning***”. He quotes *Dr. Hoffmann* in an interview for the South West German Radio:

“We hope that there are enough people here who are vulnerable and who will let themselves be wounded, so that they can hear the strange things and the unheard of things which have never yet been heard that others will say to them ...”

And Prof. Beyerhaus’ comment:

“This meant that we should be ready to call all the convictions in question, and all the presuppositions we brought with us, and even that

we should abandon them in order to open ourselves up to ‘unheard of things’, *perhaps even that which contradicts our Christian Faith ...!*”

When the white delegates “*became involved*” and accepted this condition, and were subsequently confronted by the coloured delegates with all the evils of ‘colonialism’ and with the ‘evils of missionary activities carried out in name of colonialism’, the stony-faced white delegates were eventually made to feel so crushed that they not only became ashamed of their colour, but ever so much more importantly for the marxists staging the show (*and for Satan behind them*) became ashamed of their Christian religion. And to make up for the evils done, they voted for the moratorium on mission activity.

The reader is now sufficiently up-to-date with the thrust and the mechanics of this “Eighth Conference on World Missions” to grasp what Prof. Beyerhaus is saying on the reports that emanated from it.

“These reports sketch the blurred contours of an approaching unified religion in which Christianity contributes merely some formal suggestions for the general ideas of God, religion and salvation. Inasmuch as the name of Christ *in the sense of the Cosmic Christology promulgated at New Dehli* (1961), is still retained, all this is a typical, alluring example of syncretism”. (P.53)

So the World Council of Churches has adopted the “*cosmic christ*” of Teilhard de Chardin, that evolutionary figment of a feverish imagination ...

One more report from Prof. Beyerhaus’ book, this one on ‘*communal prayer*’:

“The meditation is a compilation of *ten* modern beatitudes, which, with ecumenical generosity, embrace all modern religious, social and political experiences of ‘salvation’: from American Pentecostalism, through Chinese Maoism to ‘God-is-dead’ theology. The following are among them:-

“You were a poor Mexican baptized by the Holy Spirit and the blood of the Lamb. ... I rejoice with you, my brother.”

“You were an intellectual Chinese who broke through the barrier between yourself and the dung-smelling peasant. ...I rejoice with you, my brother.”

“You found all the traditional language meaningless and became ‘an atheist by the grace of God’. ... I rejoice with you, my brother”.

“Thus for the first time in the history of Christianity, an ecumenical conference has here joined in rejoicing over the fact that someone had

become an atheist and that even ‘by the grace of God’ ...” (P. 73).

Are we allowed to wonder how Archbishop F. Little of Melbourne and bishop R. Mulkearns from the diocese of Ballarat would fare in any ecumenical gathering where, because of their membership of the World Council of Churches, they would be asked to join in and extol ‘beatitudes’ which reject a dung-smelling peasant by Christianity, but rejoice over someone becoming an atheist “by the grace of God ...”

It is all very well for bishops to claim ‘Vatican II ecumenism’ on their side to justify association with the World Council of Churches, but the New Dehli World Conference of the WCC, in which the ‘Cosmic Christ of Teilhard de Chardin’ was officially adopted when it adopted his “cosmic Christology”, happened to take place in 1961, and so can only be reached by a detour, bypassing *Vatican II*, since *Vatican II* **blocked** teilhardism and filtered it out for rejection.

And so *no ecumenism* can be claimed by any Catholic bishop, who would link his (Arch)diocese with teilhardian heresies and syncretism through his association with the World Council of Churches. Not only would membership stifle all protest against the blatant display of marxism on the World Council as witnessed by the extolling of atheism, but it would furthermore make Catholics agreeable to the formulations of such policies, a fact to which the reports of **all** the World Conferences of the WCC since the New Dehli debacle have testified: Upsala, Kyoto, Louvain, and beyond.

2. From what we read in so-called ‘official documents’, many Religious appear to be firmly convinced, that their blatantly modernistic ideas of the *Religious Vows* can be traced to *Vatican II*. So was one Sr. Kelly recently allowed to write in the Melbourne diocesan paper *The Advocate* (May 4, 1978) that (luckily for the good nuns): “Canon Law on Religious mostly good”. In the body of the article under this headline she enlightened us on the following:

“Participants also discussed changing interpretations of the religious Vows of poverty, chastity and obedience.”

For 2000 years they have always meant only one thing. Now hear how this timeless meaning is being changed into its opposite and, *through the philosophy of sameness*, still held up to us as being the same.

“Formerly (i.e. for 2000 years, ever since the days of Our Lady and Her Son) *poverty* meant: *do without*, Sr. Kelly said. Now it means: transcend material things. *Chastity* meant: *Stay away from*. Now it means: loving availability of service. *Obedience* meant: *Do not do this or that*. Now it means: mutuality (between community leader and member) in discerning the Father’s will.”

If this cannot be traced to the Second Vatican Council, although strongly implied here, then where does it come from?

During the Second Vatican Council a book appeared entitled: *Generation of the Third Eye*, in which some 20 leading American Catholics on the sunny side of 40 were asked to write down candidly their experiences as Catholics and what they hoped the Council would change. This book is a marvellous example of the ‘bypass’ we are talking about here, illustrating the modernism quite rampant in ‘intellectual Catholic circles’ at that time, and what they expected would eventually be able to be traced back to the Council. A Nun was also asked to write her thoughts on the matter, and here is part of what she had to say:

“Our community is going through a phase of Karl Rahner spirituality and these past few months I have been meditating on a *Cross Currents* reprint of his *Reflections on Obedience*. Here, with his characteristic gift of brushing away the non-essential, Rahner finds the meaning of religious obedience in ‘the permanent binding of oneself to a definite mode of life’ ... Obedience, then, is by no means to be understood as a mere abstract readiness to do the will of another ...”

[It may help if the reader knows that this dear soul is, amongst other things, (don’t laugh!) a member of the society for *Existential Phenomenology* ... She continues]:

“As a nun I am solidly behind Card. Suenens’ exhortation that the religious orders of women be represented at the Council and - even more importantly - that they participate actively in the revision of Canon Law, *which will enable them to make needed changes in their own Constitutions* ...”

It appears to me that there is a great similarity between the Sr. Kelly mentality and that of the ‘Nun in the bypass’ who could not trace her ideas to the Second Vatican Council. Instead, she claims to be greatly inspired by a theologian who has thrown his enormous weight behind the teilhardian theology of the rejection of Original Sin, supporting the master’s advocacy of polygenism ‘even on scientific grounds’!, but not without disastrous effects to his reputation.

What Fr. Rahner “sweeps away in those articles with his characteristic gift” is very essential to Dogma and Catholic Faith, and was not supported by *Vatican II*. Furthermore, the art of ‘sticking to one’s lifestyle’ has nothing to do with the Vow of Obedience, but can quite easily have a lot to do with ‘doing your own thing’, pigheadedness, and worse ...

If this is the sound of some of the earlier ‘Catholic’ voices-in-the-bypass, what were the non-Catholics encouraged to say?

3. The following is taken from a book called *The Coming World Church* by a group of Protestant scholars, who gathered their evidence from various existing documents on the activities of the World Council of Churches. It was printed in 1963 and so was researched and compiled some years *before Vatican II*. Obviously, the Second Vatican Council does not inspire either the teaching reported herein, or the theories advanced, or the practices put into operation. So *no bishop* may claim inspiration from *Vatican II*, if he contemplates joining up with the world body described in this book: the World Council of Churches.

“*Dr. G. Bromley Oxnam* is credited with having prepared the blueprints for both the National Council of Churches (American) and the WCC. He thoroughly understood the role they would play in achieving his dream of ‘*The coming Great Church*’.”

[Now listen carefully to what this ‘dream’ is based on]:

“In his book *On the Rock*, this late great ecumenist *bypassed* all the basic tenets of evangelical Christian doctrine, and called for the abandonment of all traditional and organizational barriers to church union. He proposed first to bring about inclusive cooperative Protestant action in the realm of church functions. Next he would create an ecumenical ministry. The bishop himself said he would be gladly re-ordained under this system. He declared:

“I would gladly kneel in a service of mutual sharing in which the blessings of the different ordinations might be *symbolically* conferred upon me”.

Then Oxnam enlarges the picture:

“United actions in many fields would follow ... missions ... education ... united theological seminaries ... the ministers of the church. The union of American christianity would electrify the world and accelerate the trend towards union in every continent. ‘Finally’ said the bishop, ‘it will be possible to kneel before a common altar with the Roman Catholic Church, beg forgiveness of the Christ for disunity and sharing the bread and wine of holy communion, rise in his Spirit to form the Holy Catholic Church to which all Christians may belong’.”

If this is the theory, then (still quoting from the same book) *what is the practice?*

“In America this ecumenical church is being built through the actions of

Councils affiliated with the National Council of Churches, (NCC, like the one existing in Australia) and in mergers of various denominations. The Northern California Council of Churches will make a good example. A local Council has a *Comity Committee* which has assigned certain territories to certain denominations *to the exclusion of all others*. Before any new church can be established, permit must be secured (*coercion*) from the local Council of Churches. City planning commissions and even national housing administrators are advised that *maverick churches*, that is, those that do not bear the stamp of Council approval, should not be allowed to construct buildings in areas under their control.”

And now comes the crunch ...

“All pastors of Churches which have been allocated specific territories by the Comity Commission are advised that they represent not only their own denomination but also *the Ecumenical church*. They are required to emphasize the teachings ***which their denominations share with the rest of Christendom***. In other words, the ecumenical church already exists in the thinking of the Council, as does an ecumenical ministry, with all planning for the future motivated by a determination to achieve *One Church for One World*.” [End of quote].

This leaves in clarity as with regard to both theory and practice nothing to be desired.

It is becoming pretty obvious that the Catholic Church which neither can nor will go along with this sort of ecumenism, as it is impossible to bind Her to teach only what is shared by the rest of ‘christendom’, is heading for the classification of a “*maverick Church*” by the unanimous decision of all the churches and councils which DO go along with it, *including the ‘Catholic’ slice that joined them ...* It is quite likely that in the years to come many bishops of the Roman Catholic Church will start contemplating the step which has been taken here in the Archdiocese of Melbourne and its suffragan diocese of Ballarat, and will take their dioceses within the Council of Churches, with the inevitable consequences as described here, including that they will leave the Catholics who do not want to join up to fend for themselves as best they can. The American experience (already dating from 1963) is a sobering thought for all of us.

A few pages back the question was asked:

“*When will it be popular to start persecuting?*”

Here is one answer:

- When individual Catholics have been *effectively* isolated by this

type of action.

- When they are *not* allowed to talk about, or teach, the doctrines not shared by the rest of Christendom.
- When they are *only* allowed to stress the ‘cosmic christ’ of the WCC, the one shared by all the denominations.
- When they are requested to take “communion” from an ecumenical minister whose Sunday it happens to be.
- And when they refuse to go along with any of this ...

It is interesting to see in this context what, by Divine Revelation, we know will happen; and what St. John described in the 13th chapter of the Book of Revelation: how the second beast (or the false prophet) which looks like the Lamb but speaks like the Dragon will do everything in its power to use the religious unity of the world to obtain the political unity under the first beast. He also tells us that “*The whole world will run after the beast.*” In support of this interpretation we quote here the official teaching of Pope *St. Pius X* who wrote in 1910:

“... for the establishment of a One-World ‘Church’ which shall have neither dogma nor hierarchy, neither discipline of the mind nor curb on the passions, and which, under the pretext of freedom and human dignity, will bring back to the world the reign of legalised cunning and brute force and the oppression of the weak, and of all those who toil and suffer.”

Same thing. Only this time the information is raised above the level of private interpretation of Scripture to the authentic voice of the Magisterium. And we can be sure of one thing: the ‘ecumenism’ and practices of the One-World ‘Church’, held up here by Pope *St. Pius X* as a warning for us, can never be traced back to *Vatican II*. Whoever contemplates joining up with such a global agglomerate, can only do so on the inspiration of the *bypass* where the rejects of *Vatican II* congregate ...

CHAPTER FIVE

“The Good Will Be Martyred ...”

(Our Blessed Lady at Fatima)

The stakes are high ...

“The goal of the boldest ecumenical thinkers and leaders has grown increasingly clear: to construct a world community embracing all races, classes, religions and political systems, united as far as possible under a common world government whose business will be the establishment of world peace. It is hoped that *a Universal Church will be able to pave the way successfully for a Universal Government.*”

This comes so close to what St. John wrote to us in his Book of Revelation about “the second beast doing everything in its power to subjugate the whole world to the tyranny of the first beast”, that the question is legitimate: “Is Prof. Peter Beyerhaus indulging here in ‘private interpretation of Scripture’, *or is this an exercise in sheer clear thinking from available evidence?* He continues:

“Such a universal church would, however, not only be trans-confessional, it would also be unconditionally open to partnership with other religions and ideologies. The former General Secretary of the WCC, *Eugene Carson Blake*, declared in October, 1970 at the World Conference of Religions for Peace, in *Kyoto*, Japan, that the church unity for which the WCC strives, is only a first step on the way to the ultimate goal of a united mankind ... In the advocates of the ecumenical movement we are encountering today, we find a passionate *religious-political* view of missions, whose ardor, fanned to a new high at *Bangkok*, refuses to let any objections keep it from its goal.

If anyone does stand in the way,

- he is wooed in a friendly manner,
- simply passed over as unimportant, or, if these methods are not effective,
- wrathfully attacked ...”

(Prof. P. Beyerhaus in *Bangkok* 73).

Which means that the Passion of the Church - like the Passion of Christ - has inexorably been set in motion. The mind of the persecutor is clear. The first shots have been fired. The global extent of the stakes show that the Catholic Church will for the first time in Her history be persecuted on a global scale. The Catholic Church, that is, which refuses to go along with the empire and church of Satan under whatever name. And in country after country, this Church will live forth in isolated

Catholics-on-the-outer, living under unbearable pressure, political, economic, social and religious, to join up ...

And it is for the training of these Catholics that God gave us Vatican II ...

The testimonies and evidence are overwhelming.

- Our Lady speaks the Truth. And at Fatima She categorically declared:
“The good will be martyred.”
- The Bible speaks the Truth. And St. John categorically tells us that
“The whole world will run the after the beast, which will make war on the Saints and overcome them.”
- Pope St. Pius X speaks the truth when he informed us that the One-World ‘Church’ *“would bring back to the world the reign of legalised cunning, and brute force, and the oppression of the weak and of all those who toil and suffer.”*
- Vatican II speaks the Truth. And in several places in its documents it reminded us of our duty *“to shed, if necessary, our blood for our friends and for Truth.”*
- Finally, we can be sure that, ultimately, our enemies will speak the truth when they will say to us:
“Look, we wooed you, we ignored you, we warned you. You will not listen. Now we must wrathfully attack you’...”

These Catholics will be asked to completely join in the Mystical Life of Christ, which is a Life of self-immolation for the sins of the world. And so, the *means* and *inspiration* to join in the Mystical Life of Christ to such a degree lie hidden in the Mystery of the Church, which Herself draws strength continuously from this Mystical Life in Christ. This Life is **the** Mystery of the Church and can only be seen with the Supernatural Light and Eyes of Catholic Faith.

And if *Vatican II*, in the Providence of God, was meant to prepare Catholics in the process of being persecuted, for such a participation in the Mystery of the Church, then *Vatican II* itself must, to a very high degree, share in this Mystery, which means that it becomes incomprehensible in any other light except the strong Light of Catholic Faith. In this Light it did not matter which ‘instruments’ took part: the *Rhine* or the *Tiber*, but only what God created with these instruments for the Life of His chosen ones.

If people got confused after *Vatican II*, scandalized by *Vatican II*, or tried to manipulate *Vatican II* for their own designs and purposes: it all only showed the lack of Catholic Faith in these people, *their lack of oil* ...

- God knew that the persecuted Catholics during the most terrible persecutions yet to be unleashed, would feel alone, deserted, and would only have their Catholic Faith to guide them. So He made sure that in the training period immediately following on *Vatican II*, these conditions would be present to a lesser degree.
- He knew that during those persecutions His faithful ones would be requested to love their persecutors. So, in the training period, He provided us with innumerable opportunities to strengthen us in the exercise of this all-embracing demand.
- God remembered that in the Sacred Passion of His only-begotten Son, *ONLY OUR LADY* understood what was happening and what was requested of Her. So He made sure that *Vatican II* would once again reveal the most beautiful teaching on Our Lady and the Church for the consolation of all who would be prepared to stay with Her under the Cross.
- He also remembered how ill-prepared the Holy Apostles were when they came face to face with the disfigurement in His Son during His Sacred Passion. So He allowed a certain disfigurement in the Mystical Body of His Son in the post-Conciliar period, so that His persecuted faithful would draw strength for the time when the Catholic Church would follow Her Spouse *till the bitter end*.

And thus, in page after beautiful page, the Catholic Church poured out Her Love for humanity in the Second Vatican Council. The teilhardians, on their erroneous philosophy of *identity* and *sameness*, thought it was at last the signal they had been waiting for: to be finally allowed to *identify* themselves with the world and its ways on the evolutionary teachings of Teilhard de Chardin. And the Church let them go, knowing that much would be restored after Her own faithful would wash the whole world once again clean in their own blood ...

For further reading consult the following:-

- “Teilhard de Chardin and the Dutch Catechism”;
- “The ‘theology’ of Teilhard de Chardin”.

Both these articles are on the following web page:

<http://www.pipeline.com.au/users/frits/default.HTM>

This page can be reached by clicking on the “AMAIC Internet Homepage” **link** at the bottom of the AMAIC Bookroom Home Page.

- “Analysis of the ‘*Joint Declaration*’ on the Doctrine of Justification” – the article before the current one on the AMAIC Bookroom, Catholic Philosophy page.
- “Darkness” – which is to be found on the AMAIC Bookroom, Catholic Apologetics page.

Dedicated, with great respect, to the memory of Pope PAUL VI, who literally lived Vatican II in the embrace of all who came to visit him, and who taught Vatican II in his everlasting encyclicals.

First Edition

On the Feast of the Holy Rosary,
Saturday, October 7th, 1978.

Second Edition

Holy Week, 1995.

Third Edition

February 2, 2000.

Postscript:

Some thoughts on the document called “Vatican II”

The *purpose* of this document is to show that, no matter what can be said about the turmoil surrounding the post-Conciliar Church, these upheavals cannot be laid at the doorstep of this unique Council. Just as the turmoil surrounding the passion and death of Our Blessed Lord on the first Good Friday could not be traced to the Son of God as the cause for this violent disruption. And just as the cause of the grave dislocation on that first Good Friday must be traced to the hatred deeply embedded in the false tradition of the Pharisees, priests and scribes at the end of the Old Dispensation, so it is that now the cause of the violence done to the Holy Church must be traced to the hatred the Modernists have for the Catholic Tradition of this unique Catholic Church; a hatred deeply embedded in their own false ‘tradition’. And just as Our Blessed Lord on that first Good Friday allowed Himself to be sacrificed for the salvation of Jews and Gentiles, so was it that Vatican II allowed the Holy Church to be sacrificed for that same sinful humanity two thousand years later.

So, in *Chapter One* of this essay on Vatican II, the author takes a good, hard look at the pre-Vatican II scene, to see which section of the Catholic Church has the *right* Catholic Tradition, and which section has the *wrong*, the *false* ‘tradition’. Furthermore, it is of great importance that readers of this document are under no illusion as to the *essence* of the falsehood of this spurious ‘tradition’. Hence the in-depth treatment of this falsehood and of its worldwide spread and acceptance in the evolutionary ‘philosophy’ and ‘theology’ of the adherents of this modernist ‘tradition’.

Chapter Two deals with the most important question of Catholicism in the modern world:

- which tradition presented at the gates of this genuine Council was allowed through, and
- which tradition was filtered out and rejected.

Tradition-with-a-capital-T, *Catholic Tradition*, was everywhere allowed through after suitable updating of matters of Catholic discipline, even in the documents where the Holy Church was breaking new ground.

Now it is indisputable that, if this Council came directly from the firm guidance of the Holy Spirit, the post-Conciliar turmoil around the changes in the Liturgy and around the two questions of “the genuine ecumenism” and “true religious liberty” could not possibly come from the Holy Spirit, could not possibly come from the Catholic Church, and so could not possibly come from Vatican II itself. Just as the upheavals around Our Lord’s sacred Passion and Death could not possibly come from His teachings or from His sacred Person. The genuineness of Vatican II is found in the attentive reading of, and the prayerful meditation on its documents, as well as in the authority of the Holy See. Everything is up for grabs if the Council is

rejected as an elaborate hoax, as a victory for the *Rhine*, that is for liberal protestantism, which eventually must mean: for Modernism. Just as the crucifixion and death of Our Lord must then be seen as a victory for His enemies, for Caiaphas and his mob. So the true meaning of Vatican II lies in its mystique. We have to tread very carefully here.

In *Chapter Three* we deal with the burning question: If Modernism, and with it the victory of its ‘tradition’ and ‘inspiration’, were ruthlessly filtered out of Catholicism by Vatican II, whence then the post-Conciliar turmoil?

This question is on a par with what we can ask ourselves with regard to the appearance of Our Lord and Saviour on earth, made real by the same firm guidance of the Holy Spirit at His Incarnation. If the Son of God had ruthlessly sifted out the falsehoods of the faked Jewish ‘traditions’ of His day from the Tradition He wished to leave as a legacy to His Church on earth, why then the utter confusion at the time of His sacred Passion and Death?

The answer is the same for both questions.

At the time of Christ it was allowed by God for the *Redemption* of a sinful human race, and 2000 years later, in our days, it is allowed by that same Divine Providence and Mercy for the application of this Redemption: the *Salvation* of that same sinful humanity. And just as Caiaphas’ following had utterly resisted the acceptance of their defeat and the rejection for what they stood for at the hands of our Divine Saviour, but found a *bypass* around Him to hand Him over to Pilate for martyrdom, so it is with the Modernists of our days. They came into the sheep fold by some other means, and according to Our Lord’s saying, they must be seen as brigands and robbers because they entered to maim and kill. The Jewish leaders of Our Lord’s time wanted Him treated as an unmasked criminal, a hoax, and the Modernists of our own days, took control of local churches everywhere to do exactly the same with the Catholic Church. And just as with Christ before Pilate the Evangelist could write: “*And their cries gained the upper hand*” [Lk. 23:23], so it is in our days.

And so in this chapter 3 we deal with a question uppermost in our minds:

“What is driving these people? What is their motive? What is this fools gold so tantalising that they are prepared to stake everything on its acquisition, including their birthright to eternal life?” “What was driving Archbishop Marcel Lefèbvre into schism and to eventual excommunication?” The answers to these legitimate questions are clearly dealt with in this 3rd chapter.

Chapter Four deals with the obvious question:

If the Modernists of our days succeeded in finding a bypass around Vatican II, were there any traces of this detour already in existence in the sense that, if there were, with whom did our enemies make common cause?

The changes in the *Liturgy* have been held up by innumerable Catholics as one cause for dissent. Others have pointed to the unfamiliar teaching of *the true ecumenism* and that on *true religious liberty*. Although the charity of Pope John Paul II has managed to find a way to keep many of these Catholics within the Catholic fold, individually they still have to answer before God how they see their inner dissent from Vatican II and the *Novus Ordo*. Just as the Jews outside Caiaphas' 'tradition' nevertheless had to answer for their doubts and misgivings with regard to Our Saviour's Passion and Death and His *Novus Ordo* of the New Sacrifice, insofar as they had allowed themselves to be guided and inspired by that 'tradition' at that most critical time of their lives. Although their modern counterparts are not the real enemies of Our Holy Mother the Catholic Church, they lose many graces attached to unreserved filial submission.

And so Chapter 4 deals with the plots and subversions of the real enemies, the Modernists and their interlaced networks, whereby they are connected with those outside the Church for Her destruction.

Finally, Chapter Five deals with the question of the *mystique* of Vatican II whereby it lives in the intimate union of the Spouse, the Mystical Body of Christ, with Her head, Christ. It was in the intimacy of this union that the Holy Catholic Church took Her most devoted children to the window opened by Pope John XXIII to see the plight of mankind as Christ saw it from His Cross. As is stated in this documentary, in several places of the documents of Vatican II, the faithful are not only reminded, but urged, to be prepared to shed their blood for the salvation of the world. And just as in Caiaphas' days his mob accelerated the Passion of Our Saviour Jesus Christ, so in our days the Modernists are doing exactly the same in regard to the Passion of Our Holy Mother the Catholic Church. From a vantage point such as this it has now become very clear indeed how much natural understanding and supernatural insights are missed by those who harbour and nurture in themselves misgivings and mistrust about any aspect of Vatican II.

In many countries of the world and their parishes the *Novus Ordo* is badly treated by priests who belong to, or are inspired by the Holy Church's enemies *in the bypass*. But so was the Sacred Body of Our Lord abused on the Friday after the Institution of the most Blessed Sacrament in the Cenacle. Unbearable for most except for Our Lady. We can go through the same mutilations at Her hand ...

Frits Albers, Ph.B. Easter 2000.