

Vatican II vs Church Dogma I

Transcription of a talk by Fr Gregorius Hesse

Transcriber Note:

Fr Hesse quotes extensively from a translation of encyclicals and documents that do not follow the same format and wording of the documents currently available on the internet. We have not attempted to reconcile the two sets, but are preserving the words of Fr Hesse pertaining to the encyclicals and documents.

Fr Hesse:

Yesterday, talking about the first document of Vatican II *Sacro Sanctum Concilium* on the liturgy, I forgot to quote what Pope Gregory XVI in his encyclical *Mirari Vos* had to say about the idea of changing the Church and simplifying the liturgy and adapting the ecclesiastical law to the needs of the times. Some people accuse me of being very explicit in what I say. I will show you what Gregory XVI said. This is *Mirari Vos*, No 10 and 11: 'It would therefore be a crime, a formal derogation from the respect due to the ecclesiastical laws, to blame by insane liberty of opinion, the discipline which the Church has consecrated by which the administration of holy things and the conduct of the faithful are regulated, which determines the rights of the Church and the obligation of its ministry, and to declare that discipline hostile to certain principles of natural law are incapable of acting by inherent imperfection are declared subject to the civil authority.

But since – to use the words of the Fathers of the Council of Trent' – this is No 11 – 'It is certain that the Church was instructed by Christ and His Apostles and that the Holy Ghost never fails by daily assistance to teach us all Truth. It is the height of absurdity and outrage to pretend that the restoration and the regeneration have become necessary to secure its existence and its progress. As if it could be believed that it was thus subject either to faintness, darkness or other alterations of this kind. And what do these old innovators seek except to give new foundations to an institution which would thereby be only man's work. And realize what St Cyprian cannot sufficiently detest by rendering the Church human from all divine that is'.

I think this is pretty clear. Gregory XVI does condemn the idea of a restoration, a regeneration of the Church necessary to secure its existence. Vatican II did not believe Gregory XVI and this is why Vatican II ceased to be Catholic.

The next document we have to deal with is probably the most scandalous of all. This is the Decree on Ecumenism Vatican II *Unitatis Redintegratio*, Nov 21, 1964. Again this document was published on the day to the day exactly 10 years before Archbishop Lefebvre published the *Declaration of the Principles of the SSPX*. The

Decree on Ecumenism cannot really be understood in its evilness, in its lies, before you understand the Catholic concept of the unity of the Church.

Pope Leo XIII in the encyclical *On the Unity of the Church*, June 29, 1896, encyclical called *Satis Cognitum* speaks and pronounces as the Supreme Pastor and Teacher of the Church the Catholic concept of the unity of the Church. He says in No 5 and he quotes from St Cyprian: 'There is one God, and one Christ; and His Church is one and the faith is one; and one the people, joined together in the solid unity of the body in the bond of concord. This unity cannot be broken, nor the one body divided by the separation of its constituent parts.' And again: 'The Church cannot be divided into parts by the separation and cutting asunder of its members. What is cut away from the Mother cannot live or breathe apart.' And again St Cyprian: 'Whosoever is separated from the Church is united to an adulteress. He has cut himself off from the promises of the Church, and he who leaves the Church of Christ cannot arrive at the rewards of Christ... He who observes not this unity observes not the law of God, holds not the faith of the Father and the Son, clings not to life and salvation.' This is the unity of the Church.

And Pope Leo XIII continues in No 6: 'But Christ indeed Who made this one Church, also gave it unity, that is, He made it such that all who are to belong to it must be united by the closest bonds, so as to form one society, one kingdom, one body - one body and one spirit as you called in one hope of your calling.' Ephesians 4:4

And Leo XIII continues in No 8: 'On the one hand therefore it is necessary that the mission of teaching whatever Christ had taught should remain perpetual and immutable, and on the other that the duty of accepting and professing all the doctrine should likewise be perpetual and immutable.'

And he quotes St Cyprian again: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ when in his Gospel he testifies that those who are not with Him are His enemies does not designate any special form of heresy but declares that all heretics who are not with Him and who do not gather with Him scatter His flock and are his adversaries. He that is not with Me is against Me and he that gathereth not with Me scattereth.'

And then Leo XIII remarks, quoting the Epistle of James: 'Whosoever shall offend in one point has become guilty of all. Whosoever denies one Truth Catholic Church teaches denies them all.' Wanting or not wanting so.

Remember what I said about objective and subjective. Russian Orthodox priest somewhere in Siberia who has never heard of the Catholic Church under Communism perhaps did not know better. We are not judging him. We are not pronouncing subjective judgement. Objectively he was a heretic and a schismatic separated from the Church and in the state of mortal objective sin against the 1st Commandment.

Leo XIII in No 10 describes the Church: 'God indeed even made the Church a society far more perfect than any other. For the end of which the Church exists is as much higher than the end of other societies as divine grace is above nature, as immortal

blessings are above the transitory things on the earth. Therefore the Church is a society divine in its origin, supernatural in its end and in means proximately adapted to the attainment of that end; but it is a human community inasmuch as it is composed of men. For this reason we find it called in Holy Writ by names indicating a perfect society. It is spoken of as of the House of God, the City placed upon the mountain to which all nations must come. But it is also the fold presided over by one Shepherd and to which all Christ's sheep must betake themselves. Yea, it is called the kingdom which God has raised up and which will stand forever. Finally it is the body of Christ - that is, of course, His mystical body, but a body living and duly organized and composed of many members; members indeed which have not all the same functions, but which, united one to the another, are kept bound together by the guidance and authority of the head.'

This is the true description of the Church and not what Vatican II, Vatican II blasphemously pretended to teach in the document *Lumen Gentium* which we discussed yesterday.

Leo XIII makes it abundantly clear that there is only one Church. There is no such a thing as 'sister churches'. There is no such a thing as churches that are not united with the Catholic Church but are churches. They are not churches – they are a sect. They are religions that are enemies of Christ. Maybe they don't want to be enemies of Christ, but they are. It might be mentally insane person, excuse me, today you say mentally challenged person, who is really nothing else but a psychopath, an arsonist, fire alarm prone in politically correct term would set fire to this hotel. He does not want to kill you because he doesn't even think of it, but he is our enemy all the same objectively. And this is what I have to say about the churches that are not Catholic, all of them, without an exception.

Vatican II blasphemously as ever, even more heretical than before, demands Ecumenism. Ecumenism in the new sense, not in the old classic sense of talking about everything that belongs to the House, as Leo XIII just described the Church, the House and the Oecumene everything that belongs to the house. Ecumenism nowadays means everything that belongs to that strange, very, very mythical – not mystical - but mythical house of all the churches and all mankind and everybody anywhere. It is hard to believe that Vatican II would really dare to say the following but it did: *Unitatis Redintegratio* No 3. After having stated that there is only one Church of God, they nevertheless deface themselves when they say '...according to the conditions of each Church or community, these liturgical actions most certainly can truly engender a life of grace, and one must say, can aptly give access to the communion of salvation.'

They are talking about Protestant services. I give you the whole paragraph: "The brethren divided from us" – Leo XIII just said, quoting St Cyprian, they are not just divided from us, they are not our sister churches, they are the enemies of Christ - not for Vatican II perhaps because Vatican II is the enemy of Christ.

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

So here we hear that the Protestant mass of Thomas Cranmer in the cathedral of Canterbury in England can truly give access to the communion of salvation. This is heresy and it is blasphemy. This is not proximate heresy. This is direct heresy. This is condemning the Pope's judgment on the Protestant churches. It is condemning the Popes that excommunicated Henry VIII and his followers. It is condemning the Pope that excommunicated Martin Luther and his followers. It is condemning the Popes that said that if you go to the Protestant church on Sunday, you are excommunicated. This one line alone would be sufficient to grab this whole book and dump it where it belongs – in the trashcan.

But no, it is not sufficient yet for Vatican II, they want more. 'It follows that the separated churches and communities as such, though we believe they suffer from the defects already mentioned, have been by no means deprived of significance and importance in the mystery of salvation. For the spirit of Christ has not refrained from using them as means of salvation which derive their efficacy from the very fullness of grace entrusted to the Catholic Church.'

So, if you go to a Protestant church, you get the grace derived from the Catholic Church. No. The Popes have explicitly condemned this opinion. The Council of Trent and Vatican I and especially recently Pope Pius XI in his encyclical *Mortalium Animos* which you can have from the Angelus Press. It's short, easily understood. You should get it.

Pope Pius XI talks about the people who hold that the unity of faith in government, which is the note of the one true Church of Christ, has up to the present time hardly ever existed and does not exist today. They consider that this unity is indeed to be desired and may even by co-operation and good will be actually attained, but that meanwhile it must be regarded as a mere ideal, and they immediately go on to say that the Roman Church too has erred and corrupted the primitive religion by adding to it and proposing for belief doctrines not only alien to the Gospel but contrary to its spirit. Others again even go so far as to desire the Pontiff himself to preside over their mixed assemblies. This is the ecumenical meetings with the Anglican church. For the rest, while you many hear many non-Catholics loudly preaching brotherly communion in Jesus Christ - Vatican II is among those nonCatholics - yet not one will you find to whom it ever occurs with devout submission to obey the Vicar of Jesus Christ in his capacity the teacher and ruler. Meanwhile they assert their readiness to treat with the Church of Rome, but on equal terms, as equals with an equal – Assisi. But even if they could so treat, there seems little doubt that they would not do only so on condition that no pact into which they might enter should compel them to retract those opinions which still keep them outside of the fold of Christ.

You can easily see that it is always the Catholic Church, and the so called Catholic Church with Pope John Paul II who is definitely not a Catholic, to say that we retract the opinion - they don't. They don't. The Protestants have not retracted one of their errors.

And in *Mirari Vos* again Gregory XVI says in No 14: 'We now come to another and most fruitful cause of the evils which at present afflict the Church and which we so bitterly deplore, we mean indifferentism or that fateful opinion everywhere diffused by the craft of the wicked, that men can by their profession of any faith obtain the eternal salvation of their souls. Because of the wicked opinion' – he says it's a 'wicked opinion diffused by the craft of the wicked that men can by the profession of any faith obtain the eternal salvation of their souls provided their lives conform to justice and probity. But in a question so clear and evident it would undoubtedly be easy for us to pluck up from amid the people confided to your care so pernicious an error'. That means what Vatican II writes in the Decree on Ecumenism has been called a 'pernicious error' by Gregory XVI.

'The Apostle – that means St Paul – warns us of it. One God, one faith, one baptism. Let them tremble then who imagine that every creed leads by an easy path to the port of felicity and reflect seriously on the testimony of our Saviour Himself that those who are against Christ, who are not with Christ, and that they miserably scatter by the fact that they gather not with Him, and that consequently they will perish eternally without any doubt if they do not hold to the Catholic faith and preserve it entire and without alteration. Let them hear St Jerome himself who was living at the epoch when the Church was divided into 3 parties. He, faithfully to what had been decided, incessantly repeated to all who endeavored to win him over: Whosoever is united to the Chair of Peter is with me.'

Now mind you, he said 'to the Chair of Peter'. He said not to the present successor of Peter. He said 'to the Chair of Peter'. It is the present successor of Peter who is not united 'to the Chair of Peter' because he says things directly opposed to what his predecessor said.

And in No 15 Gregory XVI says: 'From this poisoned source of indifferentism flows that false and absurd or rather extravagant maxim, that liberty of conscience should be established and guaranteed to each man', and to this I will have to come back with the document of Liberty of Conscience in Vatican II because Vatican II really went into teaching almost everything that had been condemned by the previous Popes.

It is of no wonder when we find the present Pope pronouncing and uttering heresy. He just follows the Council he praises so often and so much as being the second Pentecost which is blasphemous to say – the Holy Spirit came once.

'For the spirit of Christ has not refrained from using them' – the Protestant and divided churches – 'as means of salvation.' Pope John Paul II in *Catechesi Tradendae* No 32 says: 'to the efforts of whom the spirit of Christ does not deny to give

salvation.' 'The efforts of whom' is referring to the Protestant churches. 'The Protestant churches to the efforts of whom Christ does not deny to give salvation.' That is heresy. If the Pope had said that the Protestant could possibly, might be, saved in spite of the religion he belongs to, I would not have objected. Nobody would have been able to object even though it's a daring statement because I have never met a Protestant who was saved! Neither has the Pope! No. He said 'for the efforts of whom Christ does not deny salvation'. Jesus Christ Our Lord is not capable of giving salvation to the efforts of the Protestant churches because God cannot contradict Himself. One Church, one faith, one Baptism. The Protestants, some of them have the Catholic sacrament of Baptism. Not a single Protestant religion has our faith. They deny the Real Presence in the Blessed Sacrament, they deny the sacramental priesthood, they deny the Sacrament of Confession. They do not have one faith with us. They deny the faith, and St Cyprian, affirmed by Leo XIII, St Gregory XVI, said: 'if they deny only one point of faith, they deny all of them'.

Therefore, they are not even Christians in the real sense of the word. Baptism has never turned a human being into a real Christian. In order to be a real Christian, you also have to agree with the faith. A Protestant child that knows no better implicitly agrees with the Catholic faith until the age of reason. Some people beat it out of him. A Catholic child does the same until it comes under the influence of Vatican II and the people who belong to the church of the new Advent, as it is called in *Redemptor Hominis* by John Paul II. And of course, if the Protestant churches – according to the viewpoint of Vatican II and the heretical present Pope – have the faith, then how come they deny some things that we hold firm, how come they deny some things that we hold steadfastly to?

Well, this is a question the Pope doesn't answer because the Council hasn't answered it. It's one of the tricks of Modernism, as Pius VI said in his encyclical *Auctorem Fidei* condemning the pseudo Synod of Pistoria. The trick of the Modernist is to be ambiguous, to teach things that can be taken back half way but also interpreted in another way. And as St Pius X says in his encyclical *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* on Modernism 1907, there he says: 'The Modernists, they always give you some and then take away some other things'.

When you discuss with the priest of the Opus Dei, as I've had the doubtful pleasure of doing, when you discuss with the priest of the Fraternity of St Peter, as I've had the doubtful pleasure of doing, they will always say: 'But is the Pope not Catholic because, see here, he says something and it's so beautifully Catholic?' No. The Pope cannot be a Catholic if he says 99% of the time the true things and 1% of the time the wrong thing. There are 100% Catholics or no Catholics.

That's what St Cyprian said very clearly and he was just referring to Our Lord Himself. Our Lord said – I quoted this yesterday but it seems I have to quote it over and over again: 'For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled'. One jot or one tittle. You say no to one thing only, the Catholic Church teaches, you have just left the Catholic

Church, really left it, left it for good until you convert and come back, until you convert and submit yourself again to the entire teaching of the Church. Iota Unum.

The Protestants therefore are not Catholics. They are outside of the Church. They are outside of the House. They do not belong to any type of oecumene. They cannot be dealt with in ecumenical activities. The only thing you can do with the Protestants is pray for their conversion to the Catholic faith. And unfortunately, I have to say the same thing about those people who adhere to Vatican II, as the Fraternity of St Peter does, and to those people who believe the Novus Ordo can be celebrated in a Catholic way, as the Fraternity of St Peter does. Mind you, their individual priests might think quite differently, and some do, but the Society itself has signed a paper to that point.

And of course, Vatican II, needless to say, demands a dialogue with the Protestants. I don't know what they want to discuss. I have lived in Rome for 15 years. For 15 years I was always confronted with the desire for dialogue. I have never understood what they really wanted to discuss – conversion was never the issue, conversion was never the topic. Every year in January there was a week following the 25th of January which is the Conversion – Conversion of St Paul mind you – they had the ecumenical week and there were priests and bishops coming in from the Secretariat for the Unity of the Christians, apart from the fact that most of them do not even know how to celebrate Mass. I had the bishop's secretary there – this is public so I can might as well talk about it. I had the Bishop's secretary of the time, Tyrella Cascante (sp approx), who needed the book to pronounce a correct blessing at the end of the Mass. He did need the book – these are the people who decide on what we will discuss with the Protestants.

Well, I am not surprised. The new Mass of Paul VI was written up by 7 among other members of the Commission, 7 Protestants. People have asked me 'How do you know? Please where is the footnote? Please give us the quotation. You have the quotation. Ask Card Stickler in Rome. Read in the Latin Mass magazine the interview with Card Stickler where Card Stickler says: 'There were 7 Protestants in the Commission. I should know. I was a member of the Commission.' Card Stickler has repeated this in private. I was his secretary for 2 years. We talked almost every day. He repeatedly in private told me about it. Repeatedly. So this is the footnote. If that's not good enough, I can't help you.

I told you yesterday that I detest the term 'Pilgrim Church' and that I consider it quite wrong to talk about a Church that has to fulfil a pilgrimage on earth. Some people might think why is he so hung up with the concept of 'Pilgrim Church'. This is because of the way Vatican II itself interprets the term 'Pilgrim Church'.

Here it goes: *Unitatis Redintegratio* No 6

'Christ summons the Church as she goes her pilgrim way to that continual reformation' – to that continual reformation – *Mirari Vos* condemns the claim for a necessary reformation. *Ecclesia semper reformando* does not mean that the Church

as a whole – the Church as the mystical body – the Church as the perfect society – has to be reformed. That's impossible. The *Ecclesia semper reformando* means the members of the Church and they badly need it more than ever!

'Christ summons the Church as she goes her pilgrim way to that continual reformation of which she always has need in so far as she is an institution of men here on earth' - you are right about that – 'consequently if, in various times and circumstances, there have been deficiencies in moral conduct or in the church discipline, or even the way that the church teaching has been formulated - to be carefully distinguished from the deposit of faith itself - these should be set right at the opportune moment and in the proper way.' No Sir!

The very concept of condemning the formulation of church teaching in the past is heretical and it has been condemned explicitly in *Mortalium Animos* when Pius XI says No 12 - Don't get me confused – I am not quoting Vatican II now but the Catholic Church and the person of Pius XI.

No 12: 'How so great the variety of opinions can clear the way for the unity of the Church we know not, so far as dialogue is concerned, that unity can arise only from one teaching authority, one law of belief and one faith of Christians. But we do not know that from such a state of affairs it is but an easy step to the neglect of religion or indifferentism and to the error of the Modernists who hold that Dogmatic Truth is not absolute but relative, that it changes according to the very varying necessities of time and place and the varying tendencies of the mind that is not contained in an immutable tradition, but can be altered to suit the needs of human life.'

No 13: 'Furthermore, it is never lawful to employ in connection with articles of faith the distinction invented by some between fundamental and non-fundamental articles.' This is exactly what *Unitatis Redintegratio* No 5 does. No 6 does. I say again No 6 says – Vatican II – the reform is needed for even in the way that the Church teaching has been formulated to be carefully distinguished from the deposit of faith itself. This should be set right at the opportune moment and in the proper way.'

So they are distinguishing the *depositum fidei* – the deposit of faith – from some other teachings of the Church which obviously seem to be minor. They are not – I repeat what Pius XI said: 'Furthermore, it is never lawful to employ in connection with articles of faith the distinction invented by some between fundamental and non-fundamental articles. The former are to be accepted by all, the latter being left to the pre acceptance of the faithful.'

I quoted *Humani Generis* yesterday where Pius XII says Ordinary Teaching binds every Christian. You freely, without proving your point deny Ordinary Teaching, you just leave the Church. And please, join another one.

The supernatural virtue of faith has at its formal motive the authority of God revealing and this allows of no such distinction. The faith is absolute. It is not relative. All true followers of Christ therefore will believe the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God with the same faith as they believe the

Mystery of the august Trinity, the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff in the sense defined by the ecumenical Vatican Council No I of course with the same faith as they believe in the Incarnation of Our Lord. If somebody tries to tell me, as John Paul II does, that the Orthodox Church is our sister Church, I reject that. The Orthodox Church rejects the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff as defined by Vatican I. Therefore they reject everything else, they want it or not. I don't care if they are interested in it or not, if they want it or not, I am not the judge of the members of the Orthodox Church. The Orthodox Church as such is not our sister church – it's our enemy.

Furthermore, the Council goes on to say: 'Grace to be obtained sometimes commends it the concrete course to be adopted, when all the circumstances of time, place and person have been duly considered, is left to the prudent decision of the local episcopal authority unless the Bishops Conference according to its own statutes or Holy See has determined otherwise.' They are talking about worship in common.

Worship in common with nonCatholic religions has been under the pain of excommunication for more than 15 hundred years.

Anybody who dares to concelebrate with the Russian Orthodox – they have concelebration - Catholic priest who dares to concelebrate with the Russian Orthodox was immediately, immediately, excommunicated and member of the Catholic Church that dared to fulfil "Sunday duty" at the Mass of a schismatic or heretical church was immediately in the state of mortal sin according to the judgment of the Church. Now they leave it to the local episcopal authority to decide if you will have communicatio in sacris. They actually really use the term.

Worship in common - communicatio in sacris - is not to be considered as means to be used indiscriminately for the restoration of unity among Christians. There are 2 main principles upon which the practise of each common worship depends. First, that the unity of the Church which ought to be expressed and second, that of sharing in the means of grace. The expression of unity very generally forbids common worship. However, and then comes the paragraph that I quoted 'for the good of the faithful, for promoting unity, you may nevertheless do it'. And later on the same document says: First they say communicatio in sacris is not the proper means but in No 15 they say:

'Therefore some worship in common – communicatio in sacris – given suitable circumstances and the approval of Church authority is not merely possible but is encouraged.'

This is the most double tongue Council in history. And these are the most double tongued documents in the history of the Church! In one point they say communicatio in sacris is not the proper means and then they say it is encouraged, left up to the local authority.

They talk about the Eastern Churches. I refer to the Eastern Churches that are not in communion with the Catholic. No 17:

'What has already been said about legitimate variety we are pleased to apply to differences in theological expressions of doctrine in the study of revealed Truth. East and West have used different methods in approaches in understanding and confessing Divine things. It is hardly surprising then if sometimes one tradition has come nearer to a full appreciation of some aspects of a mystery of Revelation than the other or has expressed them better.' That means not just talking about the united Churches in the East but also talking about the Eastern Churches in communion with the Holy See. This document here tries – dares to say – that they have understood things better.

In *Quo Primum* Pius V quoting the Church Fathers calls the Catholic Church the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, the very Mother Church of all, the Teacher of all the other Churches. There is no such thing as a truth expressed better in another Church, even in a Church united with Rome. There is no such thing. The Church Fathers rejected that concept and so have all the Popes until Pius XII. That does not keep Vatican II from pronouncing the contrary in No 17 in *Unitatis Redintegratio*.

Then in No 22 they say: 'Although the ecclesial communities separated from us' – that means the heretics and schismatics, all excommunicated – 'although they lack the fullness of unity' – the wrong concept of unity again – either there is unity or there is no unity at all – there is unity or separation. There is no such thing as full unity, $\frac{1}{2}$ unity, $\frac{1}{4}$ unity, $\frac{1}{8}$ unity, $\frac{1}{16}$ unity. That is garbage. These people are mentally challenged, I tell you. The word 'unity' does not admit a division. 'Although the ecclesial communities separated from us lack the fullness of unity with us which flows from baptism, and although we believe they have not preserved the proper reality of the Eucharistic Mystery in its fulness'... Where is the old saying that if you deny one dogma, you deny all? '...not preserved in its fulness especially because of the absence of the sacrament of Orders'... - that's probably a minor impediment - '...nevertheless when they commemorate the Lord's death and Resurrection in the Holy Supper, they profess that it signifies life in communion with Christ and await His coming in glory. For these reasons the doctrine about the Lord's Supper about the other sacraments - worship and ministry in the Church – should form subjects of dialogue.'

Doesn't that sound familiar to you when they say here the Lord's death and resurrection, when they commemorate the Lord's death and the Holy Supper, they profess that it signifies life in communion with Christ and await His coming in glory. That's the proper response to the *Mysterium Fidei* after the Consecration of the new Mass. Vatican II here and again the interpretation of this paragraph is not mine, the proper interpretation of this paragraph is to be found in the new liturgy. Vatican II in this line here gives up the doctrine of Real Presence and sacramental priesthood when it demands dialogue with people who reject the Presence of Christ on the altar and reject the sacramental priesthood. I do not dialogue with them. I explain the faith to them and I tell them right in their face 'Take it or leave it!'

The result of this scandalous document was a meeting between Paul VI and Athenagoras, the Patriarch of the Greek and Byzantine Churches not united with Rome, in 1965 which had the ironical result of some of the monasteries at Mt Athos excommunicating their Patriarch because he embraced the Roman Papist Bishop. At least these are heretics with principles! There is no dialogue among Athos.

The result was the following statement. This is not Vatican II itself. It's a document resulting from Vatican VII.

Among the obstacles along the road of the development of these fraternal relations of confidence and esteem, there is the memory of the decisions, actions and painful incidents which in 1054 resulted in the sentence of excommunication leveled against the Patriarch Michael Cerularius and two other persons by the legate of the Roman See under the leadership of Cardinal Humbertus, legates who then became the object of a similar sentence pronounced by the patriarch and the Synod of Constantinople.

In No 2 of the Common Declaration they say: 'Among the obstacles to be found in the way of the development of these brotherly relationships of trust and esteem, there is the memory of those painful decisions, acts and incidents which led in 1054 to the sentence of excommunication delivered against Patriarch Michael Cerularius and 2 other persons by the legate of Rome'. They dare call this 'painful decisions' and they call that 'incidents', 'acts', 'incidents'. That means it was a painful decision and an incident when saintly Leo IX excommunicated the heretical and schismatical Patriarch! Saint Leo IX excommunicated them. The present Pope never gets tired of quoting this. But he overlooks that these excommunications were pronounced most of the time by saints. It was Saint Leo IX who excommunicated that schismatical Patriarch. It was Saint Gregory VII who excommunicated the Emperor, and it was Saint Pius V who fought the Turks, a fact for which now John Paul II goes out of his way to apologize. As a matter of fact a few lines of this document that I read to you are so scandalous, so efficient in their lies, that I can only recommend to you to have a look at the present relations between the Catholic Church in Rome and the Eastern Churches. In one of the next issues of CFN you will be able to read JV's conference given in Philadelphia 3 weeks ago in Peter's Basilica. St Josaphat died for the unity of the Ukrainian Church and Rome.

Pope John Paul II mocks the martyrs who have died for the unity of the Ukrainian Church and Rome. When he says – he doesn't say it personally – that's the way you do it today – you let the Congregation sign this stuff – and in the Balamand Statement, the Catholic priests in Ukraine are asked to submit to the Orthodox local bishop. This is high treason. If it was not the Pope, he would be due to capital punishment, except that no earthly authority can judge the Pope in these things. But let us remember what Innocent III said: 'The less a man is judged by men, the more he will be judged by God.'

I recommend to you...I will on another occasion go into the depth of Ecumenism and to the absurdities it has caused, especially with the present Pope. Meanwhile I

recommend to you to read *Mortalium Animos*. It is short, precise and to the point. I recommend to you to read *Mirari Vos* by Gregory XVI – again a short encyclical. In those days the Popes believed in expressing themselves in short and distinct ways, clarified terms, not come up with ambiguous terms and hundreds of pages of bla bla as the present Pope so much enjoys to do. Unfortunately I do not have the jurisdiction to keep him from doing that. But I want you to understand that what he is doing is high treason to Christ. It is high treason to the Catholic Church.

There is no dialogue with people who reject the truth. As a personal principle – forgive me for making a personal remark – I have lots of patience, lots of patience for people who are interested in the truth. My patience for those who do not want to hear the truth is limited to a 'hi'.

You must bear with me – sometimes where quotations are concerned my eyesight is not what it used to be and sometimes in the quick run of the conference I don't find the proper quotations in time and I don't want to interrupt too much because in that case the tape would have to be cut 20 times over again before you get a decent copy.

So let me quote now 2 paragraphs of *Mortalium Animos* which I should have quoted right at the moment when we were talking about dialogue.

Pope Pius XI in *Mortalium Animos* No 10 says to pan-Christians. He gave the term 'pan-Christian' to all these idiots who wanted to have a common religion of all Christians which of course as you now understand is impossible and is absurd. I quote: 'These pan-Christians who strive for the union of the churches would appear to pursue the noblest of ideas in promoting charity among all Christians: but how should charity tend to the detriment of faith? Everyone knows that John himself Apostle of love, who seems in his Gospel to have revealed the secrets of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and who never ceased to impress upon the memory of his disciples the new commandment to love one another, nevertheless strictly forbade any intercourse with those who profess the mutilated and corrupt form of Christ's teaching. St John says: If any man come to you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not in the house, nor say to him 'God speed you'.'

That means that I am going further than St John did. I say 'hi' to the heretics. And for those who do not have my first tape:

Heretics All by Hilaire Belloc

In Tarbes or Nimes, or over the sea,
You never shall have good words from me.
Caritas non conturbat me.

But Catholic men that live upon wine
Are deep in the water, and frank, and fine;
Wherever I travel I find it so,
Benedicamus Domino.

On childing women that are forelorn,
And men that sweat in nothing but scorn:
That is on all that ever were born,
Miserere Domine.

To my poor self on my deathbed,
And all my dear companions dead,
Because of the love that I bore them,
Dona Eis Requiem.

No 11 of *Mortalium Animos*: Therefore, since the foundation of charity is faith pure and inviolate, it is chiefly by the bond of one faith that the disciples of Christ are to be united. A Federation of Christians then is inconceivable in which each member retains his own opinions and private judgment in matters of faith, even though they differ from the opinions of all the rest. How can men with opposite convictions belong to one and the same Federation of the faithful, those who accept sacred Tradition as a source of revelation and those who reject it, those who recognize as divinely constituted hierarchy of bishops, priests and ministers in the Church and those who regard it as gradually introduced to suit the conditions of the time, those who adore Christ really present in the most Holy Eucharist through that wonderful conversion of the bread and wine – Transubstantiation – and those who assert that the Body of Christ is there only by faith or by the signification and virtue of the sacrament. How so great variety of opinions can clear the way for the unity of the Church we know not. That unity can arise only from one Teaching authority, one law of belief and one faith of Christians. But we do not know that from such a state of affairs it is but an easy step to the neglect of religion or indifferentism.' The rest I quoted.

When I quoted *Mirari Vos* by Gregory XVI saying that we must hold steadfast to the consecrated traditions, this at the same time means what I said yesterday, but the customs of the Church in the administration of the sacraments, the rites in celebrating the sacraments have been handed down to us as a Sacred Tradition. No man shall touch them. Not even the Pope, otherwise you could not call them 'consecrated'. Something that every Pope might change according to his own beliefs is not something that you could call 'consecrated'.

The law of how to elect a Pope – that may be changed by every Pope to his liking - is not a 'consecrated' thing and never was considered such in the Church. If Canon Law has to be adapted to the times and sometimes, needless to say, Canon Law being Positive Law, ruling the relation of one Christian to another, is something that will have to be adapted to the present times. But Canon Law is not sacred. It is only a lot holier than Secular Law.

The next document we have to discuss...I am going to talk about very shortly... It is the Dogmatic Constitution of Divine Revelation, *Dei Verbum*, Nov 18, 1965. The fact that it is a Dogmatic Constitution does not mean it is a Dogma. A Dogmatic

Constitution before it declares to be a Dogma only means to say it is a Constitution teaching. It is not a Constitution giving practical advice – it is a Constitution giving teaching. What makes a Dogmatic Constitution a Dogma is the solemn pronouncements mostly in the negative form at the end of the document saying: 'Whosoever says that this is not so, let him be accursed, outside of the Church, anathema sit.'

In No 8 *Dei Verbum* pronounces a heretical definition of Tradition. You can read about this in detail in one of the next issues of CFN because that's what I spoke on in Philadelphia 3 weeks ago. My whole conference will be published in CFN. I am only going to say one thing here. According to the will of the Fathers of the Vatican Council, somehow the concept of Tradition has been changed around. Now Tradition can change. I quoted Leo XIII before saying: Tradition cannot change. The faith cannot change. Dogma cannot change. There is no hierarchy of truth – there is only one and the same Truth.

I quoted Pius XII saying that the Ordinary Magisterium is to be obeyed. The Ordinary Magisterium being only such when – by the way – there is lots of theological manuals from the old days that will say the same that I say – the Ordinary Magisterium – the Ordinary Teaching of the Pope only being binding of course if he does not contradict his predecessors.

Here in this Council they dare to change the concept of Tradition by saying Tradition knows progress. The exact quotation: 'Tradition comes from the Apostles, makes progress in the Church with the help of the Holy Spirit. There is a growth in insights into the realities and words that are being passed on. This comes about in various ways: It comes through the contemplation and study of believers who ponder these things in their hearts, it comes from the intimate sense of spiritual realities which they experience. Thus, as the centuries go by, the Church is always advancing towards the plenitude of divine truths until eventually the words of God are fulfilled in her.' No. The Church is in possession of the full Truth. The Church cannot approach, the Church cannot come closer, it cannot advance towards the plenitude of Divine Truth. The Church has the Divine Truth in its fullness. That is a Dogma of the Catholic faith.

Tradition is not something that changes with the pondering of the believers. I don't care about the pondering of the believers and I am not interested what the religious experience of Mr X or Mrs Y are. They do not change the Truth. They do not add anything to Tradition.

The only way in which Tradition can grow is in the sense of deepening of the understanding, but, as St Vincent of Lerins pointed out, quoted by Vatican Council I, St Vincent of Lerins says: 'There is a deepening in understanding of the Truth, but eodem sensu, eadem sententia – in the same sense and in the same judgment'. You cannot reverse the judgment of 500 years ago through a better understanding or because of a better understanding. You can only deepen the understanding.

When in 1854 on the 8th of December, Pius IX proclaimed the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception, he did not say anything new. He just made sure that now we have the precise terminology on what it means.

I talked about that. But in the same context I have to mention the sad fact of the most fraudulent document issued by the Holy See, signed by the Holy Father, in the last 30 years. And it's the very same document on which Fraternity of St Peter and other groups base their existence. The document is called *Ecclesia Dei*.

The document directly contradicts the tradition of moral theology handed down to us from the past and from other Popes when it says in No 3: 'In itself this act' - they talk about the Episcopal Consecrations performed by Archbishop Lefebvre with the assistance of Bishop Castro de Mayer - 'in itself this act was one of disobedience to the Roman Pontiff in a very grave matter and of supreme importance for the unity of the Church. Such as it is the ordination of the bishops were by the apostolic succession sacramentally perpetuated. Hence such disobedience' - I checked this with the Latin - it is indeed 'such'. 'Hence such disobedience which implies in practise the rejection of the Roman Primacy constitutes a schismatic act'. No, it does not. Such disobedience as such does not constitute anything but disobedience, and the New Code of Canon Law agrees with me. Mind you, the Old Canon Law of course does because never in the history of the Church was an illegal episcopal consecration considered a schismatic act. Schism is automatically connected with the extreme penalty of excommunication. How come the Church never put illegal episcopal consecrations under the penalty of excommunication until 1949 when Pius XII was faced with the National Church of China consecrating bishops against his will?

The New Code of the Canon Law does not list - when it says in Canon 1382 that the episcopal consecrations without the mandate of the Pope are automatic excommunication - does not list this crime under the crimes of schism, under the crimes against the unity of the Church. The New Code of Canon Law does not mention the episcopal consecrations in context with schism. So the Pope cannot. The Pope is bound to Canon Law unless he wants to change it. So No 3 is a lie. No 3 is an error in moral theology.

No 4 says: 'The route of this schismatic act' - which it is not - 'the route of this schismatic act can be discerned in the incomplete and contradictory notion of Tradition'. So the Pope now accuses Archbishop Lefebvre of an 'incomplete and contradictory notion of Tradition', which is funny when you consider - I have read everything that Archbishop Lefebvre ever wrote and all I found was the most unoriginal statements, most unoriginal. He quotes the Popes, he quotes the Councils, he quotes the Saints, he quotes the Church Fathers, he quotes the appointed Doctors of the Church and he never says anything of his own. Archbishop Lefebvre was one of the most unoriginal persons in this world as far as doctrine is concerned. God bless him for that and we thank him for that! His concept of Tradition is exactly identical with the concept of Tradition dogmatically pronounced in *Dei Filius* of Vatican I and dogmatically pronounced in the appropriate section and session of the

Council of Trent and it is completely in accordance with everything that was ever said about Tradition in the history of the Church until the infelicitous year of 1958.

I say again: 'The route of this schismatic act can be discerned in the incomplete and contradictory notion of Tradition. Incomplete because it does not take sufficiently into account the living character of Tradition.' That Tradition has a living character is a concept condemned so often. But sometimes there are so many quotations that I simply, I just simply do not have them present but you will find this in CFN.

It comes with this living character of Tradition which, as Vatican II clearly taught, comes from the Apostles and progresses in the Church with the help of the Holy Spirit. 'There is a growth in insight into the realities and words that are being passed on. This comes about in various ways. It comes through the contemplation and study of believers who ponder these things in their hearts, it comes from the intimate sense of spiritual realities which they experience, it comes from the preaching of those who have received along with their rite of succession and episcopate the sure charism of Truth.' This is exactly a definition according to everything that Pius X condemns in his encyclical Against Modernism *Pascendi Domini*, but as this was my second conference in Philadelphia I recommend you reading of the appropriate issue of CFN. We do not have the time here.

Next one among the most scandalous documents of Vatican II is The Declaration on Religious Liberty. The title itself is to be condemned.

Declaration on Religious Liberty, Vatican II, *Dignitatis Humanae* Dec 7, 1965. It starts with blasphemy. No 1: 'Contemporary man is becoming increasingly conscious of the dignity of the human person'. St Pius X said: 'The only dignity in a human person is in his being a Christian.' Leo XIII said: 'Enough talk of the dignity of man, let's talk about the dignity of God'. Consequently the Council says in No 2: 'The Council further declares that the right to religious freedom is based on the very dignity of the human person as known through the revealed Word of God and by reason itself. This right of the human person to religious freedom must be given such recognition in the constitutional order of society as will make it a civil right'. Can you believe this? Let's see what the Catholic Church says about that.

In *Mirari Vos*, Gregory XVI condemns this concept when he says in No 15: 'From this poisoned source of indifferentism flows the false and absurd or rather extravagant maxim that liberty of conscience should be established and guaranteed to each man. A most contagious error to which leads the absolute and unbridled liberty of opinion which for the ruin of Church and State spreads over the world and which some men by unbridled imprudence fear not to represent as advantages to the Church. And what more certain death for souls, says St Augustine, than the liberty of error.'

The very proposal of religious liberty – something that was found among proud souls in the 19th century – was condemned by Pope Pius IX. The document is called *Syllabus of Principal Errors of Our Time* which are censured and constitutional

allocutions, encyclicals and other apostolic letters of Our Most Holy Lord Pope Pius IX. It is a collection of statements from the writings of Pius IX issued by the Holy Office in the name of the Pope, sanctioned by him and it gives a list of 80 statements. All the 80 statements are solemnly condemned in this document. And anybody who agrees with any one of these statements automatically ceases to be a Catholic. So understand what I am quoting now is NOT the doctrine of the Church. It is condemned.

No 15: 'Every man is free to embrace and profess that religion which, guided by the light of reason, he shall consider true.' Condemned sentence.

No 16: 'Man may, in the observance of any religion whatever, find the way of eternal salvation, and arrive at eternal salvation.' Condemned sentence, quoted by Vatican II as doctrine in the aforementioned document and this document.

No 17: 'Good hope at least is to be entertained of eternal salvation of all those who are not at all in the true Church of Christ.' Condemned statement.

No 18: 'Protestantism is nothing more than another form of the same true Christian religion, in which form it is given to please God equally as in the Catholic Church.' Condemned statement in the collection of Pius IX. Not literally quoted by Vatican II, but indirectly.

The *Syllabus* makes sure that the document on Religious Freedom written up by the Council Fathers is unCatholic, contradictory to the Teaching of the Church. Cardinal Ratzinger has admitted that. Nobody of the so called ½ way, 50 %, 45 1/2% traditionalists who say Fr Hesse should not break with the Church by saying that Vatican II is heretical, anybody who says that is really in contradiction to the present Prefect of the Congregation of the Faith who said the *Decree on Religious Liberty* is certainly an anti-Syllabus. And the *Syllabus* is the list of condemned sentences which I just quoted to you. So Card Ratzinger says the same thing that I do. Why he does not draw the consequences is not for me to judge.

But the *Decree on Religious Liberty* is definitely to be condemned and it is as a matter of fact the point in which Archbishop Lefebvre said no, I will not sign anything anymore now. Some of the first documents – nonetheless they contained all the errors - Archbishop Lefebvre signed and he said because at the time we were not able to imagine that a Pope would sign documents that are wrong. So we submitted. Understandable error.

And I can tell you I am a witness to this error because I committed it myself many years ago. I said it's impossible that a Pope signs things that are against the faith. I have learned my lesson and so have you.

'It is through his conscience that man sees and recognizes the demands of Divine Law. He is bound to follow this conscience faithfully in all his activity so that he may come to God who is his last end. Therefore he must not be forced to act contrary to his conscience.' The Church never said that anybody may be converted by force but

at the same time the Church said if you do not conform your conscience to our Teaching, you will – excuse me if I say it in the Irish way – go to Hell!

And now Vatican II requests the States to turn this into a law. In No 4: 'Therefore provided the just requirements of public order are not violated, these groups have a right to immunity so that they may organize themselves according to their own principles. They must be allowed to honour the Supreme Godhead' – whatever that is – 'with public worship, help their members to practise their religion and strengthen them with religious instructions and promote institutions in which members may work together to organize their own lives according to their religious principles.' So please contribute to the next donation to build a mosque in Los Angeles.

The Pope sent a delegate to the official opening of the Islamic mosque in Rome. Friends of mine in Rome who belong to a group that is called very right wing but they are very Catholic, catapulted slices of salami into the mosque. God bless them! [laughter] Actually...they are good people. See, we shoot them with slices of salami. The Koran says in Sura 47 that they are to kill us.

Well, The Vatican II is certainly a perverted Council because it is actually here requesting from the civil authorities to give complete freedom to all the heretical, schismatical and pagan religions and this is something that has been again condemned by Pius IX in the *Syllabus*.

I quote No 20: 'The ecclesiastical power ought not to exercise its authority without the permission and assent of the civil government'. This is now in the *Balamand Statement* I quoted before with the Orthodox Churches.

No 21: 'The Church has not the power of defining dogmatically that the religion of the Catholic Church is the only true religion.' Vatican II doubts it all the time. They do not say exactly the same which was condemned here but they always say something which comes out the same because if the civil authorities that always throughout the tradition of the Church had to submit to the Pope – remember Gregory XVII excommunicated the German Emperor for not submitting to the Pope, and Henry VIII was excommunicated rightly so because he split with Rome - now Vatican II says this is alright and as a matter of fact, the Pope, together with that abomination of a so called Bishop, calling himself the Archbishop of Canterbury, being a layman of course, because their Orders are definitely invalid, as Leo XIII declared dogmatically in his *Apostolicae Curae*, the Pope together with a layman in Canterbury blessed the people. If I had been stupid enough to be there, I would have walked out.

No 22 of the condemned sentences: 'The obligation by which Catholic teachers and authors are strictly bound is confined to these things only which are proposed to universal belief as dogmas of faith by the infallible judgment of the Church.' This is a necessary requisite in order to be able to have dialogue and in order to say that the other religions can save you too.

I have told you what the other Popes have said about a hierarchy of Truth. And at the end of the list of condemned sentences you will see what Pius IX said about new theories on the powers of the State and the relation between Church and State.

In No 77 condemned sentence: 'In the present day it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion should be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other forms of worship.' This sentence has been condemned. Now the document on *Religious Liberty* asks the civil authorities to turn religious liberty into a civil right. What was the result? The Constitution of Colombia in South America said that the official state religion of Colombia is the Catholic religion, the Catholic faith. Pope Paul VI had them remove that. The Vatican exercised pressure on the Colombian government for more than 3 months until they gave in and cancelled that paragraph of their Constitution.

Archbishop Lefebvre who was well versed with the different Constitutions of the different parts of Switzerland, different provinces of the Confoederatio Helvetica, which is Switzerland – the Helvetica Confederation – said that in one of the French speaking parts of Switzerland, to be precise – the Rhone Valley – the Canton Vaud – their local Constitution held the Catholic religion as the state religion. The Apostolic Nuncio in Switzerland forced them to remove that paragraph.

This is the interpretation of the document on *Religious Liberty*. So let no man say that I viciously interpret it in the way they don't. They interpret it even stronger than I would have ever.

Another condemned sentence is 78 of the Syllabus: 'Hence it has been wisely decided by law, in some Catholic countries, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the public exercise of their own peculiar worship.' Now this is a direct quotation from Vatican II that has been directly condemned by Pope Pius IX. Okay!

No 79: 'Moreover, it is false that the civil liberty of every form of worship, and the full power, given to all, overtly or publicly manifesting any opinions whatsoever and thoughts, conduce more easily to corrupt the morals and minds of the people, and to propagate the pest of indifferentism.' Mind you, this statement is saying it is false to say that the pest of Indifferentism is provoked by civil law allowing all religions. Vatican II demands from civil law to allow all religions and foster them and help them.

No 80: 'The Roman Pontiff can, and ought to, reconcile himself, and come to terms with progress, liberalism and modern civilization.' This has been condemned. 'The Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself and come to terms with progress, liberalism and modern civilization.' The Roman Pontiff, believe me, has not only come to terms with them, he superated their own desires in his own secularism and in his own indifferentism and in his own treason to the Catholic Faith. He is a traitor. To make sure he understands it, in Polish, the word is 'zdrajca'.

Religious Liberty Vatican II says: 'Religious communities have the further right not to be prevented from publicly teaching and bearing witness to their beliefs by the spoken or written word.' It's time to put the Jehovah's Witnesses on welfare, isn't it?

Also included in the right of Religious Freedom is the right of religious groups not to be prevented from freely demonstrating the special value of their teaching.' 'The special value of their teaching'! Yes. How about the Islamic viewpoint on women? I am surprised that Hillary hasn't come out strong against Islam.

Also included in the Right of Religious Freedom is the right of religious groups not to be prevented from freely demonstrating the special value of their teaching for the organization of society and the inspiration of all human activity.

This is not coming from Andrew Lave [sp unknown] if you know whom I mean. This is not coming from the White House. This is Vatican II.

These groups have the right to decide in accordance with their own religions, own religious beliefs, the form of religious upbringing which is to be given to their children. This is why now when a Catholic marries a Protestant there is no further demand of having the children baptized Catholic. It doesn't matter anyway.

'The civil authority therefore must undertake to safeguard the religious freedom of all the citizens in an effective manner by just legislation and other appropriate means. It must help to create conditions favourable to the fostering of religious life so that the citizens would be really in a position to exercise their religious rights and fulfill their religious duties and so that the society itself may enjoy the benefits of justice and peace which are the results of man's faithfulness to God and His Holy Will.'

Who are the only ones who fulfill the Holy Will of God? The Catholics. Nobody else. Vatican II says they all do.

I think this is sufficient as far as the document on Religious Liberty is concerned.

Last quotation: 'The freedom of the Church is the fundamental principle governing relations between the Church and public authorities and the whole civil order.' This is right of course. The Church claims freedom for herself in human society before every public authority. The Church also claims freedom for herself as a society of men with the right to live in civil society in accordance with the dependent of the Christian faith. So now here we have for the first time a proper understanding of Religious Liberty. Why is it that the Catholic Church has never publicly condemned the 1st Amendment to the American Constitution? Because the Popes have always known that if a country is not Catholic anyway, we might as well use their ideas about religious liberty. This does not make it Teaching. Vatican II turned it into Teaching.

The 1st Amendment to the American Constitution adopted in 1791 is not Teaching. It's a workable arrangement. Nothing more. The American Constitution is not a

document that teaches the people. It is not a religious document that says this is what you have to believe, but this is how we are going to organize our society. And in our society with the religions coming over from Europe – just think of the Mayflower that never sank – unfortunately – with all these religions coming over, the State had little choice. It might have strived for a more Catholic Constitution, but anyway it is not a Teaching document

The scandal here is that Vatican II now turned something that we had to tolerate for 200 years into Teaching.

'At the same time the Christian faithful in common with the rest of men have the civil right of freedom from interference in leading their lives according to their conscience. A harmony exists therefore between the freedom of the Church and that religious freedom which must be recognized as the right of all men in all communities and must be sanctioned by constitutional law.'

It is sanctioned by constitutional law in this country.

But where, where in this document is the mentioning of Christ the King? Pope Pius XI in *Quas Primas* pronounced as the solemn truth to be held forever that Christ is the King of all societies and that only in the Kingship of Christ we are fully dignified human beings, as Pius X said: 'The dignity of the human being lies in his being a Christian'. This document, even when it talks about the freedom of the Catholic Church itself does not mention Christ the King. And this goes to show you in which spirit these things were written.

I have dealt with Religious Liberty. Sad as it is, this is not yet the worse to come in Vatican II. In many ways, the worst of all documents, even though it is not explicitly as heretical as the other ones that I quoted are, is the *Pastoral Constitution*. So it's not even dogmatic, but it's still the worst, you will see.

Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World, Gaudium et Spes. Dec 7, 1965. They really talk about what is actually the relation between the Church and the world today. The Conciliar Church in her incredible generosity offers 'to cooperate unreservedly with mankind in fostering a sense of brotherhood to correspond to the destiny of theirs'. Christ the King is out the window again. The Church now wants 'to cooperate unreservedly', and as you will see in No 80, with the New World Order. The destiny of the human race is viewed as a complete whole, no longer as it were in the particular histories of various people. Now it merges into a complete whole.

So we are one with the Jews. We are one with the Protestants. We are one with Islam.... Tell your Moslem brother next door that you are his brother united with him but prepare for some answers. Tell the Orthodox Jew in your community who still respects the synagogue more than the Vatican Council respects the Catholic Churches by destroying them one and another. Tell the Hasidic Jew who follows the rules of his religion, whatever they are, tell the Hasidic Jew that you are one with him, you will get a probably very kind answer.

What is the final meaning of man's activity in the universe? The Council doesn't give the answer, believe me. The People of God – that's the Church, we have seen that in *Lumen Gentium* – the People of God are identical concept to the concept of the Church. 'The People of God and the human race which is its setting render service to each other.' Oh? Now the Church together with all the human beings, we 'render service to each other'.

Again, tell your Hasidic neighbour that you are rendering service to him, he will say: 'What, I have not seen it'.

In No 12 the same scandalous document says: 'Believers and unbelievers agree almost unanimously' – almost means we do not – 'believers and unbelievers agree almost unanimously that all things on earth should be ordained to man as to their centre and summit.' That is Satanism.

This is the result of Jacques Maritain's attempt to reconcile humanism and Christendom in his horrible book *Humanisme Integral, Integral Humanism*, which was translated into Italian, *Humanismo Integral*, by a certain Giovanni Battista Montini and fore-worded with the most praising terms. Giovanni Battista Montini was Paul VI.

The very concept that the Churches 'work towards man as their summit and centre' is Satanism because it is substituting God with man. It is putting man in the position of God.

G K Chesterton said about this if you say 'I am' and if you do not specify what you mean when you say 'I am', then you pronounce the word of God, then you pronounce the name of God, you claim the name of God for yourself.

Ultimate – by G K Chest

The vision of a haloed host
That weep around an empty throne;
And, aureoles dark and angels dead,
Man with his own life stands alone.
'I am,' he says his bankrupt creed:
'I am,' and is again a clod:
The sparrow starts, the grasses stir,
For he has said the name of God.

G K Chesterton knew what it meant when you put man in the position of God.

[[poem](#) by G.K. Chesterton from [The Wild Knight and Other Poems](#) (1900)]