

**PAUL VI...  
BEATIFIED?**

**By father Doctor LUIGI VILLA**

# **PAUL VI... BEATIFIED?**

**By father Doctor LUIGI VILLA**

(First Edition: February 1998 – in italian)

(Second Edition: July 2001 –in  
italian) □ □ □ □ □

**EDITRICE CIVILTà**

**Via Galileo Galilei, 121**

**25123 BRESCIA (ITALY)**

## PREFACE □

Paul VI was always an enigma to all, as Pope John XXIII did himself observe. But today, after his death, I believe that can no longer be said. In the light, in fact, of his numerous writings and speeches and of his actions, the figure of Paul VI is clear of any ambiguity. Even if corroborating it is not so easy or simple, he having been a very complex figure, both when speaking of his **preferences**, by way of suggestions and insinuations, and for his abrupt leaps from idea to idea, and when opting for Tradition, but then presently for **novelty**, and all in language often very inaccurate. It will suffice to read, for example, his Addresses of the **General Audiences**, to see a Paul VI prey of an irreducible duality of thought, a permanent conflict between his thought and that of the Church, which he was nonetheless to represent.

Since his time at Milan, not a few called him already “**‘the man of the utopias,’ an Archbishop in pursuit of illusions, generous dreams, yes, yet unreal!**”... Which brings to mind what **Pius X** said of the **Chiefs of the Sillon**<sup>1</sup>: “... **The exaltation of their sentiments, the blind goodness of their hearts, their philosophical mysticisms, mixed ... with Illuminism, have carried them toward another Gospel, in which they thought they saw the true Gospel of our Savior...**”<sup>2</sup>.

Now, this our first study of research upon the historical-religious figure of Paul VI has brought us to a sad conclusion, and that is, that the **religion** preached by Paul VI did not always coincide with that authentic, constantly taught for 2,000 years, by the perennial Magisterium, by all of the Saints and Doctors of the Church.

Although it is far from our intention to question Paul VI's sincerity, for **“only God probes kidneys and hearts,”**<sup>3</sup> we nonetheless wish to report, here, the painful findings of our study upon him, convinced as we are that he has drawn the faithful toward a **new religion**, while this continues to carry the label of **“Catholic.”**

For the drafting of this **Dossier** – given the seriousness of the stakes, especially when it comes honestly to taking one's courage in both hands to tell the **truth** in one piece, despite the risk of becoming unpopular (exactly because, customarily, **“veritas odium parit”**), the Author of this work, for more than a decade, has been going through no less than 30,000 pages of encyclicals, speeches, Conciliar documents, historical journals, commentaries and magazines of all kinds, in order to gather an overview adequate enough to weigh up the Pontificate of a Pope who has already been consigned to History, and, therefore, to discussion and possible **judgments** of his actions.

It is evident that, with this work of mine, I do not claim to have done an exhaustive analysis of the entire oeuvre of Paul VI. Yet his quotations that I present cannot certainly have a different meaning from what they contain; and therefore, the presentation of other diverse texts of his, cannot but validate the *mens* of this **Hamlet**, that is, of the **double face** of Paul VI!

However, the honest reader will find that our writings reproduce **his true dominating mentality** — so deeply rooted in him as to have disastrously inspired his entire pastoral and magisterium.

We present this work, therefore, not to rejoice in it, but with sadness. It is but the execution of a painful duty. As Faith is by now publicly attacked, we can no longer feel bound to the duty of silence, but rather to that of unmasking an anti-Christian mentality, so many

years in the making, and sinking its root in the Pontificate of Paul VI.

Certainly, writing about him has not been easy on me, as Paul VI was the Pope at the center of an Ecclesiastical collapse, the most dreadful the Church has ever witnessed throughout Her history.

In writing about him, therefore, one cannot beat about the bush, quibble in search of sensational episodes in order to hide the reality, that is, the real responsibilities of his unsettling Pontificate, in the complex framework of the Second Vatican Council.

That is why, to come to an equitable judgment **of the thought of Paul VI** and of **his responsibilities**, I had to go over again the **official texts** of his writings and of **his words**, pronounced during Vatican II and those of **his executions**. Only thus could I untangle the grave **question** of **his responsibilities** in the dreadful drama the Church has lived and has been living from the onset of the Council to this day.

I may, therefore, make mine the lesson of Manzoni in his celebrated book: “Observations Upon Catholic Morality,” in which, at chapter VII, he wrote:

**“... One must demand of a doctrine the legitimate consequences drawn from it, not those which passions might deduce from it.”**

And so, let us open directly the pages of the **First Address to the Council**, in which **Paul VI made his own, manifestly, the principle of modernist heresy** that Pope John XXIII has already expressed, in his Opening Address of the Council, on October 11, 1962, (an Address which had been inspired by the then Archbishop of Milan, Mgr Giovanni Battista Montini), in which he said:

*“Neque opus Nostrum, quasi ad finem primum, eo spectat, ut de quibusdam capitibus praecipuis doctrinae ecclesiasticae disceptetur, sed potius ut ea ratione pervestigetur et exponatur, quam tempora postulant nostra.”*

Translation: ...But, above all, this Christian doctrine be studied and exposed through the forms of literary investigation and formulation of contemporary thought.

Now, one such **principle** is unheard of in the history of all the centuries of the Ecclesiastical Magisterium, as it takes the place of the **dogmatic** principle, alone to offer proof and certainty of the **Catholic truth**, and the teaching Church has always taught that the **reason of believing** leans not at all upon scientific conquests, achieved through man’s intellect, for the **reason of believing** rests exclusively upon the **Authority of Revealing God** and that of the **Supreme Magisterium of the Church**, which received from Jesus Christ the mandate to teach it officially and infallibly.

The **principle** enunciated by Paul VI, on the contrary, becomes the negation of that of the **Apostolic Tradition**, wanted by God, and it reverses the traditional Magisterium of the Church, putting on the teacher’s desk, in place of **revealing God** and of the **Teaching Church**, the method of man’s autonomous investigation and the formulation of a purely human and arbitrary doctrine, peculiar to the philosophical-literary style of modern man – therefore, of the man of all ages, mutable with the times – forgetting that only **truth revealed by God** is immutable and eternal truth.

Therefore, they made disappear the principle that the investigation to know the **revealed data** would be that of knowing the teaching of modern thought, and no longer that of knowing the original teaching

of the Church.

But this smacks of heresy!

One cannot invent dogma, nor can one reduce it into convenient cliché, as has been done in these years of upheaval and arrogance, ignoring that **Christ, and only He, is and shall always be the absolute truth.**

How Paul VI should have trembled, for inflicting on the Church of Christ this horrible catastrophe, by means, and in the name, of an alleged Ecumenical Council!

How topical is still that whole 2nd Chapter of Epistle 2 of St. Paul to the Thessalonians: "... 2:7-11. For the mystery of iniquity already worketh: only that he who now holdeth do hold, until he be taken out of the way. And then that wicked one shall be revealed: whom the Lord Jesus shall kill with the spirit of his mouth and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: him whose coming is according to the working of Satan, in all power and signs and lying wonders: And in all seduction of iniquity to them that perish: because they receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. Therefore God shall send them the operation of error, to believe lying: That all may be judged who have not believed the truth but have consented to iniquity."

This is the reason, the only reason, in the light of the Gospel and of the Tradition of the Church that we ask the reader to follow through with the reading.

**PROEM**

During the course of the works of the XXXV Assembly of the Italian Bishops Cardinal Ruini, president of CEI (Italian Episcopal Conference), before the Pope and the Bishops, announced the decision of filing the **cause for the beatification of Paul VI**. Although the assent of the **Permanent Council of the Italian Episcopal Conference** had already been granted, the procedure for the causes of the Popes also calls, however, for the consultation of the entire national Episcopate. A Pope, in fact, is not only the **Bishop of Rome**, but he is also the **Primate of Italy**, and therefore the **placet** of the Italian Bishops was one more passage required by the canonical procedure, such as it was established by Paul VI himself, and, subsequently, by John Paul II in the document *“Divina Perfectionis Magister.”*

Rome is the diocese of every Pope. Rome, therefore, must act as official interlocutor with the **Congregation for the Causes of the Saints**. And so, Cardinal Ruini, Vicar of the Pope for the city of Rome, on May 13, 1992, issued an **“Edict,”** appeared on the diocesan weekly **“Roma Sette”** in which, among other things, it is said: **“We invite every single faithful to communicate to us directly, or else transmit to the Diocesan Tribunal of the Vicariate of Rome any ‘information’ which, in any way, may argue against the reputed sanctity of the said ‘Servant of God.’”**

Therefore, **the undersigned – who totally dissents from this initiative of beatification of Paul VI –** after waiting a few more years before putting forward his **“information against the reputed sanctity” of Paul VI**, both for religious attention on the part of the **“high assents”** to the introduction of the **cause of beatification**, and in order to follow, in advance, a part of its **canonical process**, in the hope that at least some would come forward with some **“serious**



**doubts”** (at least **upon the opportunity** of this process), has felt the duty to move on to the drafting of these **“information-pages against the reputed sanctity,”** even because morally urged by two **spurs** of John Paul II; one dated 13 May 1993, in his address to the Bishops of the Italian Episcopal Conference:

**“I received the notification of the opening of the process for the canonization (?!) of my Predecessor, Paul VI. To me, he was a Father, in a personal sense. For this reason, I can but express my great joy and my gratitude” ...**

The other, just 15 years after the death of Paul VI:

**“I do hope the process of beatification of Paul VI may soon be favorably concluded. We pray that the Lord may grant us to behold, as soon as possible, this Servant of His elevated to the honors of the altars”<sup>5</sup>.**

On May 25, 1992 I telephoned **Monsignor Nicolino Sarale**, at the **Secretariate of State**, to ask about Cardinal Ruini’s **announcement** of the filing of the **cause for the beatification of Paul VI**. He told me that the said **announcement** had been a sort of **coup d'état** on the part of the Vicar of Rome, **since “the majority of the Italian Episcopate would squarely reject it”** (sic).

I believe this true, both for the Monsignor’s profound honesty and sincerity, and for other sources that I gathered subsequently, on this **scheme to raise to the altars the two Popes of Vatican II**, in order to manifest the **supernaturalness** of Vatican II, and consequently of this **New Church** with its **Reforms**, despite the explicit declaration of Paul VI himself when he spoke of the **“self-destruction afoot within the Church** (for which he himself was primarily

responsible!).

That said, another justification for my work on Paul VI I find in the fact that, in any age, **historians and theologians have always judged every Pontificate**; hence there can be nothing extraordinary in passing a **judgment** on the pontificate of Paul VI.

Moreover, as a son, by natural right, has always the prerogative to complain about his own father and even reproach him about his acts, when these should not be in keeping with his parental duties, why should not I, a priest and a member of the “*Ecclesia Mater*,” have the right and duty to maintain the teaching I received as irreformable doctrine, and therefore eternal, from the *Ecclesia Docens* in her perpetual Magisterium?

Is my **rational homage** to God<sup>7</sup>, through Faith, perhaps to break away from that which once was taught us, and to replace it with that which is taught today, in the name of **novelty and change**?

And is the **responsible, accomplisher, collaborator** of all that occurred, during and after Vatican II, not perhaps he who sat at the **top** of the Hierarchy?

Certainly never, in the past, was there such a disconcerting conflict, or a similar contradiction between the **truths** of the past and the **alleged truths** of this present.

Definitely, one need have lost all love for the Church and for souls – atop ordinary **good sense** – to have found the nerve to propose **beatifying Paul VI!** This will to sanctify a **Pope that openly refused his duties** exceeds the limits of imagination. A Pope, like any Catholic, must indeed seek his own sanctification through the

fulfillment of the duties related to his own station.

Now, since in this **historical-theological essay** I shall attempt to demonstrate that Paul VI **did not fulfill his duty**, I align myself with the **devil's advocate**, who in every **process of beatification**, has the grave task of scrutinizing life and writings of the candidate, to unearth all that might oppose his canonization!

Of our 261 Popes only 76 have been canonized.

It also must be known that, within the framework of the procedure necessary **to establish heroic virtues** – indispensable preliminary to beatification and canonization, rather, a *sine qua non* condition – is the verification of a certain number of **posthumous miracles** attributed to the celestial intercession of the candidate. This legal procedure must be executed, as the honor of the Church and the credibility of her decisions toward everyone, believers and non-believers, are at stake. Unfortunately, some dispensations that have been done against these canonical requirements have later cleared the way to some misuses!

Now, even this pushing, unexplainable, for a quick solution of the **process for the beatification of Paul VI**, cannot but seem plain violence to Canon Law in order to rush to a positive solution, even if undeserved, and even illegal and dishonest, should a conclusion based **exclusively** upon the **positive depositions** in his favor be reached, **although Paul VI had betrayed Pius XII**, with whom he collaborated; **although he had led a hazy moral life<sup>8</sup>**; **although his Pontificate had been marred by very grave deviations from the very “*Depositum Fidei*” and consequent errors.**

For this, what more could be done, **to give a confident judgment**

**of the real thought of Paul VI** and, therefore, of his responsibility in the dreadful drama now engulfing the Church, if not quoting his own **Addresses to the Council** and his **Sunday texts**, or of particular occasions involving his mandate of Supreme Pontiff of the Church of Christ?

How many times had I noticed that Paul VI was against his Predecessors, despite the illusory quantity of mundane applause he received! How many times had I pondered his **“Great Design,”** opposed, however, to the Faith of the Catholic Tradition, to the extent of recalling to mind what St. Pius X had written:

**“This triumph of God on earth, both in individuals and in society, is but the return of the erring to God through Christ, and to Christ through the Church, which We announced as the program of Our Pontificate”<sup>9</sup>**; while the program of Paul VI I saw as the opposite, and that is: to lead to ruin the Kingdom of God through a **universal ecumenism of faith in Man** and of **cult of Man**, necessarily leading to a **Deist Humanism** in the service of the Masonic UN (United Nations).

Now, this reminds me of that **strange confidence Paul VI made to the pilgrims** that Wednesday of April 12, 1967:

**“But there is the strange phenomenon that is produced in Us: wanting to comfort you, it is transmitted to Us, in a certain sense, the sense of your peril, which we wish to remedy; it comes to Our mind, with the consciousness of Our insufficiency, the memory of the weaknesses of Simon, son of John, called and rendered Peter by Christ... the doubt... the fear... the temptation of bending Faith to modern mentality....”**

Unfortunately, this Church of Christ, under his Pontificate, indeed withered because of **his innovatory, reforming, and perturbing action**. And he could see it for himself, so much so that, in disturbing terms, on **7 December 1968** – third anniversary of his proclamation of the **Cult of Man** – he had to recognize it:

**“The Church, today, is going through a moment of disquiet. Some indulge in self-criticism, one would say even self-destruction. It is like an acute and complex inner upheaval, which no one would have expected after the Council. One thought of a flourishing, a serene expansion of the concepts matured in the great conciliar assembly. There is also this aspect in the Church, there is the flourishing, but... for the most part one comes to notice the painful aspect. The Church is hit also by him who is part of it.”**

On **June 29, 1972**, his judgment, on what was happening in the Church, was even gloomier:

**“Through some cracks the smoke of Satan has entered the temple of God: there is doubt, uncertainty, problematic, anxiety, confrontation. One does not trust the Church anymore; one trusts the first prophet that comes to talk to us from some newspaper or some social movement, and then rush after him and ask him if he held the formula of real life. And we fail to perceive, instead, that we are the masters of life already. Doubt has entered our conscience, and it has entered through windows that were supposed to be opened to the light instead ...**

**“Even in the Church this state of uncertainty rules. One thought that after the Council there would come a clear day for the history of the Church. A cloudy day came instead, a day of**

tempest, gloom, quest, and uncertainty. We preach ecumenism and drift farther and farther from the others. We attempt to dig abysses instead of filling them.” “How has all this come about? We confide you Our thought: there has been the intervention of a hostile power. His name is the Devil; this mysterious being who is alluded to even in the letter of St. Peter. So many times, on the other hand, in the Gospel, on the very lips of Christ, there recurs the mention of this enemy of man. We believe in something supernatural (post-correction: ‘preternatural’), come into the world precisely to disturb, to suffocate anything of the Ecumenical Council, and to prevent the Church’s explosion into a hymn of joy for having regained full consciousness of herself.”

**Paul VI himself admitted the hand of Satan in the conciliar and post-conciliar Church!..** But what did **he** do to save that Church of Christ from the dominance of Satan, of which he had ascertained the devastating reality? Nothing. Although **he** himself had tossed the barque of Peter into the tempest.

Ought he not, instead, with decisive and vigorous gestures, have refloated the boat from the banks in which he had mired it? Nay, he apologized and washed his hands like a new-age Pilate, saying:

**“The Pope does not believe he must follow a line other than that of faith in Jesus Christ, Who holds His Church at heart more than anyone else. He shall stifle the tempest. How many times has the Master repeated: ‘*Confidite in Deum. Creditis in Deum et in Me credite!*’ The Pope will be the first to execute this command of the Lord and to abandon himself, without anguish or inopportune anxieties, to the mysterious play of the invisible but very certain assistance of Jesus to His Church.”<sup>10</sup>**

A Pilate-speak indeed! Three years earlier, when he threw everything up in the air in order to reform, change, and modify, did he not govern, and impose his ideas, creating all the premises of that tempest on the Church, and thus relinquishing any right to fold his arms, to abandon the helm of the boat of Peter, demanding that God Himself miraculously rescue Paul's scuttled ship!

And instead, on June 21, 1972, **Paul VI went back to repeating his false doctrine** through which he sought to convince (whom?) that it was God's job to rescue His Church:

**“In some of our personal Notes, we find on this subject: perhaps, the Lord has called me to this service not because I have any flair for it, or because I govern and rescue the Church from her present difficulties, but because I suffer something for the Church and because it appears clearly that He, and not another, guides her and saves her.**

**“We confide this sentiment surely not to make a public, thus conceited, act of humility, but so that it be given to you, too, to enjoy of the tranquility that We derive from it, thinking that not our weak and inexperienced hand is at the helm of the boat of Peter, but the invisible, and yet strong and loving hand of the Lord Jesus.”**

It is one more false and hypocritical joke, for God had not put him at the helm of Peter so that he would set the boat adrift with **his Reforms**, but so that he would govern it according to Tradition, as had his Predecessors.

Paul VI should not have asked of God a miracle to save the Church again, but should instead have **humiliated himself, corrected his**

**own errors**, fulfilled the work of salvation demanded by **his** duty.

He had to quit praising and exalting the **Man making himself a god**, and think instead of the billions of men who still lie in the shadow of death and await the Revelation of the **true God, Jesus Christ**, the only one that sanctifies and saves them. Is this not the first request of Our Father: *sanctificetur nomen tuum*? And what are, then, these UN, these UNESCO and all these other **International Institutions** if not the work of Satan intent on destroying the Kingdom of Christ, His Church? Therefore, why that rushing to erect sand castles, forgetting that “*ADVENIAT REGNUM TUUM*,” which is the sole “International” that shall truly last for eternity? And how could he nurture dreams of international politics when his duty, willed by his vocation, could not be other than the relentless quest for the **Will of God, on earth as it is in heaven**?

Paul VI had not seen what the Earth had become — God having been ejected by the French Revolution — when governed under **Freedom, Equality, Fraternity**, under the false **Great Principle of 1789**, which had replaced the **Law of God**, to submit it to the **Rights of Man**? Therefore, **he** was to be the faithful Judge of the **Honor of God** and of the **Rights of God** in order that the **Will of God** be respected. Evidently Paul VI had forgotten the command of Jesus: **But seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and His justice; and all these things shall be added unto you**<sup>11</sup>; Paul VI had forgotten that the future belongs to God, to Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Savior of the World, and that, at the end of times, “**Now shall the prince of this world be cast out**”<sup>12</sup>, to make room only for the “**Church of God: One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman**.”

With such a picture before me, how could I not be tempted to ask whether Paul VI had ever had a true vocation to the priesthood? Even



the words I had read on the book of the “**Dialogues with Paul VI**” of **Jean Guitton – his greatest friend** – had made me reflect a lot:

**“I had an intense vocation to live in the world, to be a lay man ... I did not feel cut out for the clerical life that, at times, seemed to me static, closed, more interested in preserving than promoting, implying the renunciation of earthly tendencies in the measure of its condemnation of the world.**

**“Nonetheless, if one had these feelings, could one join the priesthood in the Twentieth century? If I feel thus, it means that I am called to another state, where I will realize myself more harmoniously, for the common good of the Church.”<sup>13</sup>**

**Grave words, which brought to mind those others, also written by his friend, in “Paul VI Secret”:**

**“I noticed how his thoughts were of a secular kind. With him, one was not in the presence of a cleric, but of a layman, promoted, unexpectedly, to the papacy.”<sup>14</sup>**

Paul VI, then, would have been a **layman** (not a **priest**, that is!)

That had upset me. Precisely because **the lay Giovanni Battista Montini had become “Pope” Paul VI.** □

\*\*\*

O, may Mary’s Immaculate Heart grant me the **grace** of being able to transmit, in these pages, the **truth**, in order to remain faithful to the **Faith in Jesus Christ, Our Lord, and transmitted by His Church, sole custodian of the *Depositum Fidei!*** □

**Chapter I:** His “New Religion”

**Chapter II:** His “Opening to the World”

**Chapter III:** His “Opening to Modernism”

**Chapter IV:** His “Opening to Freemasonry”

**Chapter V:** His “Opening to Universal Democracy”

**Chapter VI:** His “Tolerance and Complicity”

**Chapter VII:** His “Opening to Communism”

**Chapter VIII:** His “Ecumenical Mass”

**Appendix 1** The “Oath” On the Day of His Coronation

**Appendix 2** “Five-Pointed-Star”: “Signature” of Paul VI’s Pontificate □



## CHAPTER I

### HIS “NEW RELIGION”

The pontificate of Paul VI has been, to us, a real catastrophe, for the reason that it was an authentic revolution that set the Church off to a 180 degrees about-turn, by means of a Council that supplanted the “**Traditional Church**” with a “**New Church**” that carries us back to Luther, to the riots of the Synod of Pistoia, which Pius VI condemned with the Bull “**Auctorem Fidei**” of 1794.<sup>15</sup>

I shall attempt to demonstrate my assertions using of preference the **texts** of Monsignor Montini, Cardinal Montini, Pope Montini himself. Although perforce limited in number, the quotations will nonetheless suffice to expose his real *mens* as **Pastor and Supreme Priest of the Church of Christ**. I shall show what occurred in the Church during **his** years of government — an authentic **Revolution**.

This book of mine, I place at the feet of the Immaculate, entreating Her blessing over the Author and the readers.

\*\*\*

The **roots of his new ecclesial course** can be traced in Immanuel Kant’s **Subjectivism**, and in the **Naturalism** of Jean Jacques Rousseau, which set in motion the revolt of man against God.

But we must also evoke the great battle immediately started by the Popes, since publication of the Encyclical “*Mirari Vos*” of **Gregory XVI** (15 August 1832<sup>16</sup>), up until the time of Vatican II.

All the Popes, therefore, had stood their ground.

The **Syllabus** of 8 December 1864<sup>17</sup> listed the **errors** of Modernism: **Pius IX** never stopped fighting against **Catholic Liberalism**<sup>18</sup>; neither did **Leo XIII** with his encyclicals “*Immortale Dei*” and “*Libertas Praestantissimum.*”<sup>19</sup> **Pius X** exhaustively analyzed **Doctrinal Modernism** with the encyclical “*Pascendi*” of 1907<sup>20</sup>, and condemned Marc Sangnier’s political-religious utopia with the “**Letter on the Sillon**” of 25 August 1910. **Pius XI** continued this battle, against the new modern **heresies**, with the encyclical “*Quas Primas*” of 11 December 1925, whose doctrine stands against the current secularization; and subsequently with “*Mortalium Animos*” of 6 January 1928, anticipating the condemnation of contemporary “**Ecumenism.**” **Pius XII** – whose teachings are all against the current subversion in the Church – with “*Mystici Corporis*” of 29 June 1943, against the reformed ecclesiology; with “*Divino Afflante Spiritu*” of 30 September, against Biblical modernism; with “*Mediator Dei*” of 20 November 1947; with “*Haurietis Aquas*” of 16 May 1956; with “*Humani Generis*” of 15 August 1950, against dogmatic reformism, or **new Modernism...**

Let us ask why that which the Church had always strongly rejected and condemned, Vatican II adopted within the doctrinal riverbed?

The answer I find in the **opening address of Vatican II** of October 11, 1962, drafted by the Archbishop of Milan, Montini<sup>21</sup>, but pronounced by John XXIII; an address that opened the doors<sup>22</sup> to all

**novelties.** In fact, the “**Message to the World**” of 20 October, voted by acclamation, was a signal of victory of the “**new spirit.**” Paul VI would later make of it a dithyrambic address: “**Unusual case and yet an admirable one. One could say that the prophetic charisma of the Church had suddenly exploded**”<sup>23</sup>.

Then came “*Pacem in Terris,*” all inspired with the “**Declaration on the Rights of Man**”: rights of **freedom, of universal peace, in accordance with Masonic principles,** and for these divulged and promptly exploited worldwide.

It was only the beginning of the dissolution. With Paul VI subversion would open the cataracts and acquire unprecedented official legitimacy.

One has only to read the **opening and closing Addresses of Session II** Paul VI delivered, brimming with that **new spirit,** if with that subtle oscillation of his thought that knew how to reconcile the extremes —the contradictions — with skilful boldness<sup>24</sup>.

And so came the “**October Revolution**” with the ballot of October 30, 1963. But it will be the encyclical “*Ecclesiam suam*” of August 1964, (already hinted at in his address of September 29, 1963, which would become the Charter of his Pontificate) that Paul VI would manifest his intentions, even though persevering in his equivocal behavior, speaking of “**vital Experience... and yet faith**”; of “**Renewal... and yet Tradition and spiritual perfection**”; of “**Dialogue... and yet preaching**”... Words elucidated in a clear vision, however, of his **new Religion,** which all his predecessors had rejected.

And it would be the choice of **Reformation, of Optimism,** of

**Ecumenical Dialogue, of Opening to the World, that will produce, then, his most dangerous schemes, which he solemnly promulgated despite not scarce opposition.**

But the opposition would be crushed, and subversion prevail.

After these clear hints we can say that the subversion (of the Faith) in the universal Church is the inescapable consequence of the Pontificate of Paul VI, who used Vatican II to achieve his liberal dreams of **renovation** and **revision**.

Read:

**“...We wish to make our own the important words employed by the Council; those words which define its spirit, and, in a dynamical synthesis, form the spirit of all those who refer to it, be they within or without the Church. The word ‘NOVELTY,’ simple, very dear to today’s men, is much utilized; it is theirs... That word... given to us as an order, as a program... It comes to us directly from the pages of the Holy Scripture: ‘For, behold (says the Lord), I create new heavens and a new earth.’ St. Paul echoes these words of the prophet Isaiah<sup>25</sup>; then, the Apocalypse: ‘I am making everything new’<sup>26</sup>. And Jesus, our Master, was not He himself an innovator? ‘You have heard that people were told in the past ... but now I tell you...’<sup>27</sup> – Repeated in the Sermon on the Mount.**

**“It is precisely thus that the Council has come to Us. Two terms characterize it: **RENOVATION** and **REVISION**. We are particularly keen that this spirit of renovation” – according to the expression of the Council – “be understood and experienced by everyone. It responds to the characteristic of our time, wholly**

**engaged in an enormous and rapid transformation, and generating novelties in every sector of modern life. In fact, one cannot shy away from this spontaneous reflection: if the whole world is changing, will not religion change as well? Between the reality of life and Christianity, Catholicism especially, is not there reciprocal disagreement, indifference, misunderstanding, and hostility? The former leaps forward; the latter would not move. How could they go along? How could Christianity claim to have, today, any influence upon life?**

**“And it is for this reason that the Church has undertaken some reforms, especially after the Council. The Episcopate is about to promote the renovation that corresponds to our present needs; Religious Orders are reforming their Statutes; Catholic laity is qualifying and finding its role within the life of the Church; Liturgy is proceeding with a reform in which anyone knows the extension and importance; Christian education reviews the methods of its pedagogy; all the canonical legislations are about to be revised.**

**“And how many other consoling and promising novelties we shall see appearing in the Church! They attest to Her new vitality, which shows that the Holy Spirit animates Her continually, even in these years so crucial to religion. The development of ecumenism, guided by Faith and Charity, itself says what progress, almost unforeseeable, has been achieved during the course and life of the Church. The Church looks at the future with Her heart brimming with hope, brimming with fresh expectation in love... We can say...of the Council: It marks the onset of a new era, of which no one can deny the new aspects that We have indicated to you”<sup>28</sup>.**

Why, some **new era**, this is, which did bring us so many **new aspects**, but **sorry indeed, unintelligent, destroyers of an entire Christian Civilization**, built in so many centuries of martyrdom and constructive work, spiritual and social alike!

Unfortunately, for all this the most real and grave responsibilities must indeed be attributed to **him** who never should have done it. And the **evidence** is incontrovertible for it is derived from official **data**, present in all of his **opening** and **continuing** papal Addresses, such as “*Ecclesiam suam*” of August 1964, in the imminence of the discussion upon “*Lumen gentium*,” concluded on 21 November 1965, and with the **ENDING of Vatican II**, in particular with his **ADDRESS** of December 7, 1965, (the most disconcerting address of all), and with the **Constitutions** and **Conciliar Decrees**, strictly intended.

Now, “*scripta manent!*” (things written remain) and “*QUOD FACTUM EST, infectum fieri nequit!*” (What has been done cannot be undone.) It is this, therefore, the true identity of a **Vatican II alleged as only pastoral**, but filled with ambiguity, reticence, and surprise attacks, which demonstrate that “*Ecclesiam suam*,” far from presenting a certain support for those theses, has been used to erect a building on the sand.

One should pause and reflect a moment upon the consequence of those **four conditions** indeed dictated by Paul VI in “*Ecclesiam suam*” for a fecund **dialogue**:

1) **Clarity**: which should consist in a **perfect balance** of position between the two dialoguing parties. (But didn't Jesus send **His Apostles to Preach?** And thus, **not to dialogue!**). This **stance**, therefore, is **unheard of** in the entire history of the Church, although



She confronted the grave aberrations of **paganism**, of **polytheism**, of **Greek philosophy**, of **sophistry** of every kind. And yet the Church never dreamt of adopting that impossible principle of parity of **dialogue** between Herself and non-believers.

2) **Meekness**: one-sided, however, and excluding **Announcement** – always mandatory – and even with the exclusion of **threats of damnation** for those who *non crediderint!* Even this **new style of evangelization** is a true **betrayal of the Mandate of Christ to the Apostles**: “*Euntes docete.*” Especially now that **every Defense of the Faith** has been dismantled.

3) **Trust**: with only **two human aspects of the dialogue**; that is: trust in the **intrinsic virtue** of the **word** (**revealed** is not specified!), and **trust in the approach of those who welcome it** (with no hint at the **supernatural** action, nonetheless necessary, of **prayer** and **Grace**).

4) **Prudence**: which here is completely wanting, precisely because of those three preceding conditions indicated in “*Ecclesiam suam!*”

Again: that invitation to exercise the three superior faculties of man, with regard to clarity and dialogue, is surely not an exhortation to encourage an apostolic keenness, nor to revise the form of the language to be used. However, that the Church up until 1964 had wasted time, using radically wrong methods, hence now must reverse everything She has done and **bring Herself up to date**, had certainly been neither polite nor edifying on the part of Vatican II toward the **Church of Tradition**.

Furthermore, they call for the Church to employ, today, a technique of more perfect **dialogue**, such as that which has been invented now.

Hence one should no longer imitate, for example, the talk of a St. Stephen, the Protomartyr, with those of the **Synagoga Libertinorum**, who ended up stoning him to death because he had the imprudence not to **remain silent about truths** unpalatable to those devils. And so one should no longer learn from the **Apologist Saints** who, like **St. Augustine**, fought against all the **heretics** of their time.

In fact, **the four points** – quoted above – of “*Ecclesiam suam*” represent a pastoral position **diametrically opposed** to that of the Apostle Paul, who pointed out: “... *et sermo meus, et praedicatio mea non in persuasibilibus humanae sapientiae verbis* (“and my speech and my preaching not in persuasive words of human wisdom,” a **method** willed, instead, by “*Ecclesiam suam!*”)... *ut fides vestra non sit in sapientia hominum, sed in virtute Dei.*” (“that your faith be not in the wisdom of men, but in the strength of God.”)

The **dialogue of “*Ecclesiam suam*,”** on the contrary, after twenty centuries of **preached (not dialogued!) Christianity**, must rest exclusively upon **human means**, excluding **the fundamental necessity of the divine Grace** in order that the **Revealed Word** be fecund. Since Vatican II, no more! The Revealed Word must be presented, dialogued as a **reasoning of man, from man to man**. To Paul VI, in the **dialogue** must be the authority of the personal competence and ability of the interlocutor rather than the authority of **GOD REVEALING**. **This doctrine of “*Ecclesiam Suam*”** is latent in all the Documents, Decrees, and Constitutions of Vatican II, in which **man is made the center of everything**.

Paul VI in person having said it, no one can ever accuse us of having missed the tenor of that **character**, unsettling, paradoxical, and subversive of the Supreme Magisterium of twenty centuries, which placed **Man in the place of God**.

Read also another disquieting confession of Paul VI:

*“Nunc vero animadvertere juvat, Ecclesiam per suum magisterium, quamvis nullum doctrinae caput sententiis dogmaticis extraordinariis definire voluerit... ad cuius normam homines hodie tenentur (!) conscientiam suam, suamque agendi rationem conformare... .”* (Now in fact it delights to heed the Church through her Magisterium, but however much you will, no chapter of doctrine will have willed to define by uncommon dogmatic definitions ... to the rule of which men are today held to adapt their conscience and their reason of acting.) [Who says he must make sense?]

As one can see, here too Paul VI expressly declared that Vatican II did not intend to teach, through dogmatic definitions, any chapter of doctrine, and therefore, necessarily, **Vatican II is in no part covered by infallibility, since infallibility is tied only to the truths taught by the Universal Ordinary Magisterium as revealed – and, therefore, to be believed *de fide divina, aut catholica* – by the Solemn Magisterium and by the Ecumenical Councils, or even by the Supreme Pontiff, as regards dogmatic definitions.**

Therefore, by avoiding dogmatic definitions, Paul VI could also utter these other incredible enormities, such as are read shortly after that declaration in the same address:

*“Aliud est etiam, quod consideratione dignum putamus: huiusmodi divitem doctrinae copiam, eo unice spectare, ut homini serviat”* (!!). The Italian version, perhaps, will highlight in a higher disquieting degree the enormity of that declaration: **“...All this doctrinal wealth points but to one direction: to serve man.”**

Disconcerting indeed! For these are the words of a “Pope” who, to

further reinforce us in his thought, continues:

**“The Church has, so to say, declared Herself the SERVANT OF HUMANITY”... (Whereas Our Lady had declared Herself “ANCILLA DOMINI”)...**

He then continues: **“Servant of Humanity, at the very time when her ECCLESIASTICAL MAGISTERIUM and her PASTORAL GOVERNMENT have, by reason of the council's solemnity, assumed greater splendor and vigor. The idea of MINISTRY has been central... Has all this and all that we might say upon the HUMAN VALUE (!?) of the Council, perhaps diverted the attention of the CHURCH IN COUNCIL toward the ANTHROPOCENTRIC direction of modern culture? DIVERTED, NO; DIRECTED, YES.”**

Extremely clear yet bewildering words, for they are the violation of the principle of identity (or of contradiction).

In both one and the other, in fact, **the center is always Man.**

The remainder of the Address, then, aggravates His position even more:

**“Any careful observer of THE COUNCIL’S PREVAILING INTEREST FOR HUMAN AND TEMPORAL VALUES (!?) cannot deny that such (PREVAILING) INTEREST derives from the PASTORAL CHARACTER the COUNCIL has made ITS PROGRAM....”**

This reference, often recurring in the Conciliar and post-Conciliar Documents, to the **pastoral character** of Vatican II, creates a specious ambiguity, as it tends to distinguish itself from all the

previous Ecumenical Councils, precisely for its **pastoral character**, almost insinuating the idea that the other Councils had never paid heed to the **pastoral reasons** and, therefore, **practical**, as if they had limited themselves to chasing butterflies under the Arch of Titus, or hanging out in the stratosphere of theological abstractions. However, it is like conferring a wanton license of dunce on the Fathers of the other Councils!

To us, instead, it throws rather a shadow of suspicion upon the doctrinal validity of Vatican II, so bristling with sophisms, traps, heavy pages, with a twisted language, insidious, reticent, ambiguous. Its dwelling at the core of the issues without discerning their bottom can be seen, for instance, in the answer given by some Fathers, at the end of the **Dogmatic Constitutions** “*Lumen Gentium*” and “*Dei Verbum*.” It will suffice to read that answer, on page 254, marginal number 446, and page 522 and 523, at bottom, just beneath Paul VI’s signature, of the “*Edizioni Dehoniane*,” at the words: “*RATIONE HABITA moris CONCILIARIS, ac praesentis CONCILII (?!)... FINIS PASTORALIS...*”

(Reason having been established of the will of the Council, and of the present council ... the purpose is pastoral ... )

Before those **declarations** of Paul VI in his Address of 7 December 1965, **closing** Vatican II... and those of the “*Declaratio De Libertate Religiosa*,” before the words of marginal number 1044 and 1045, upon the “**INVIOLENT RIGHTS OF THE HUMAN PERSON**” (the only **Rights** named in those numbers, ignoring GOD’s altogether, although **PRIMARY** and **CONDITIONING** of Man’s Rights), will be clearly seen both the **lack of preparation** and the **swindle, in contempt** of the whole Supreme Magisterium of the Dogmatic Tradition of the Church antecedent to Vatican II.

Therefore, the entire second chapter of St. Paul's Second Epistle to the Thessalonians: "*Non credendum seductoribus... et tunc revelabitur ille iniquus, quem Dominus Jesus interficiet Spiritu oris sui et destruet illustratione adventus sui eum... Ideo mittet illis Deus operationem erroris ut CREDANT MENDACIO, UT JUDICENTUR INIQUITATI*"<sup>30</sup>, will always be topical.

(The seducers must not be believed ... And then that wicked one shall be revealed: whom the Lord Jesus shall kill with the spirit of his mouth and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming ... Therefore God shall send them the operation of error, to believe lying: That [the wicked] may be judged ...)

All that is left to do is to confide in the Lord, repeating with the Apostle, "*Scio enim CUI CREDIDI, et CERTUS SUM quia potens est DEPOSITUM MEUM SERVARE IN ILLUM DIEM.*"

(For I know whom I have believed and I am certain that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him, against that day. – 2 Tim. 1:12)

\*\*\*

At this juncture, one finds oneself confronted with a **New Christianity**, that of Paul VI, who has endeavored to render Christianity more **present**, more interesting for the man of today.

But his was a wrong course. The religion founded by O. L. Jesus Christ is essentially **supernatural**. According to human wisdom, however, His teachings, transmitted to us by the Holy Gospels, are absolutely incomprehensible and unacceptable. **A God who makes Himself Man**, who let them insult Him, scorn Him all the way to the ignominy of the Cross... **A Master beatifying sacrifice and suffering** and preaching the annihilation of His own self is certainly not loved by the world for His doctrine, but He is loved only through Faith, with a vision, that is, supernatural, which transcends

completely the human vision of things.

Paul VI and the Vatican II, instead, pushed things in a manner that, by degrees, God has almost disappeared to make room for man. In this picture, Christianity has become **religion of man**, and although the name of God remain and the religion be still called “Christian,” in reality, however, it is nourished only by the second Commandment, filled with “**let us love one another,**” with “**enough with religious war,**” with “**let nothing stand in our way anymore**”... in order to embrace only those things that might unite us.

This is in radical opposition to the Gospel that teaches, instead, the **supremacy of God** and of **His Love**. Therefore, if we are to love and serve our neighbor, too, we are to do it because God the Father loves him in the person of His Own Son Jesus Christ, and thus **without the love of God, even the love of man has no sense anymore**<sup>32</sup>.

Paul VI could not deny openly this dogmatic truth, but he went as far as to say that love is “due to every man for his **quality of man.**”<sup>33</sup>

However, from the reading of **his texts** his obsession, his primary anxiety is only, or almost, at the level of man. In fact, he expresses himself thus:

**“This Council... in conclusion, will give us a simple, new and solemn teaching to love man in order to love God.”**<sup>34</sup>

**“...To know God, one has to know man.”**<sup>35</sup>

**“All these doctrinal riches (of the Council) aim at one and one thing only: to serve man.”**<sup>36</sup>

**“We too, no more than any other, We have the cult of man.”**<sup>37</sup>

**“The religion of the God who became man has met the religion (for such it is!) of man who makes himself God. And what happened? Was there a clash, a battle, a condemnation? There could have been, but there was none!”<sup>38</sup>**

And so forth, as in this other **passage** of March 27, 1960, at a conference:

**“Shan’t modern man, one day, as his scientific studies progress and discover realities hidden behind the mute face of matter, come to prick up his ear to the wonderful voice of the Spirit palpitating in it? Shan’t it be the religion of tomorrow? Einstein himself perceived the spontaneity of a religion of today... Isn’t the work already in progress along the trajectory leading straight up to religion?”<sup>39</sup>**

Astonishing indeed! **Montini, here, preaches a religion wherein the supernatural and the Revelation are excluded!** One could say that, to **him**, the religion of tomorrow would no longer be that of Jesus Christ, which is communicated to man through the Grace of the Faith, of the Holy Gospel, of the Passion of Christ, of the Holy Eucharist... No! That other **religion** of his shall be the **“religion of the universe,”** a result, that is, of the **“straight trajectory” traced by work and scientific research.** A **dream**, however, which has nothing to do with the Christian Faith, for Christianity is divine religion, flowing out from the Sapience of God, and thus contrary to the sapience and preferences of man fallen with original sin.

Christianity, therefore, is opposed to **human development** in the sense intended by the world, for Christianity places itself on a supernatural level, where the development is certainly real, but altogether different. The Saints, in fact – shining examples of



Christianity – **have never attempted to realize themselves**, but rather to mortify themselves and renounce everything for the love of God. It is the Christian asceticism that realizes us in a wonderful spiritual blossoming in which the true freedom of the sons of God is to be found.

Instead, **the humanism of Paul VI** (which he often confuses, in his writings and speeches, as if spirit and matter might form one sole thing), places itself at the level of the exclusive **human reason**, coupled with a **natural conscience, as a norm**, whereas, on the contrary, Christianity places itself at the level of the Faith, taking **the Holy Gospel as norm to follow in the course of life**.

The great mistake, therefore, of Paul VI was that of being rather a humanist than a Christian, putting the Gospel at the service of **his humanist dream**, identical to the ideal of Freemasonry, whose ideal of **Liberty, Equality, Fraternity**, would be achieved through the development of the universal conscience.

The whole of the writings and speeches of Paul VI show, with sad clearness, that **man, rather than God, is the center of his cares...** That all was thought out, judged, and directed in function of man.

A Christianity, **Paul VI's**, unpinned from the Cross. Namely:

- **a Christ** considered a **liberator**, not so much from sin as from suffering, from humiliation, from enslavement;
- **a Gospel** mixed up with the **Charter of Man's Rights**, and placed at the service of **social justice**;
- **the Rights of God** neglected, to the advantage of the exaltation of the **Rights and preferences of man**;

- an evangelization **reduced to dialogue, not to convert,** and resting upon human **rather than supernatural means...**

Paul VI has substituted:

- **the supremacy of the supernatural** with the supremacy of the natural, of the temporal, of man;

- **the supremacy of the “Law of God”** with the supremacy of conscience;

- **the supremacy of the “Kingdom of God”** and of **“eternal life”** with the supremacy of the world, of history, of **his** chimera toward **achieving a sort of paradise on earth.**

After which, one could accuse Paul VI of giving man a **“cult”** that should not be given him. Man must certainly be loved, but not of a disorderly love, that is, a love not regulated by the love of God or independent of His love.

The **“cult of man,”** instead, leads to the myth of the sameness among all men, hence the leveling of the classes (with all the violence this brings about), hence **universal democracy** (another **utopia** dear to Paul VI), which is but **Masonic universalism.**

Let us further quote, therefore, some other **“text”** that illustrate this **“cult of man”** in Paul VI, so evident in his humanism.

In **his “Address” to the Last Public Session of Vatican II,** Paul VI made a sort of **“profession of faith”** that sounds unprecedented that **his** speaking of man, who must be understood, respected, and admired, ended up in an authentic **“cult of man!”**

**“The Church of the Council – said he – has much focused on man, man as he really is today: living man, man all wrapped up in himself, man who makes himself not only the center of his every interest but dares to claim that he is the principle and explanation of all reality... Secular humanism, revealing itself in its horrible anti-clerical reality has, in a certain sense, defied the Council. The religion of the God who became man has met the religion of man who makes himself God. And what happened? Was there a clash, a battle, a condemnation? There could have been, but there was none. The old story of the Samaritan has been the model of the spirituality of the Council. A feeling of boundless sympathy has permeated the whole of it. The attention of our Council has been absorbed by the discovery of human needs. But we call upon those who term themselves modern humanists, and who have renounced the transcendent value of the highest realities, to give the Council credit at least for one quality and to recognize our own new type of humanism: We, too, in fact, We more than any others, honor mankind; WE HAVE THE CULT OF MAN!”<sup>40</sup>**

But as soon as September 14, 1965, Paul VI was asking himself:

**“Could the Church, could We but look upon him (man) and love him?...” “The Council is a solemn act of love toward humanity. May Christ assist us so that it be truly so.”**

Now, speaking in such a way has a flavor of abdication, of servility in front of atheism in order to obtain its favors. But **Paul VI** calls it **“a merit,”** whereas, on the contrary, it is an abandonment, a deformation of Charity. Instead of condemning the insane pride of man, who exalts himself and is no longer willing to submit to God, Paul VI fondles him, wants to appear likable to him, affirming that **he**

and **his peers** have a **“cult of man”** that surpasses even that of atheist humanism!

It was then this very form of idolatry toward man that caused **Religious Freedom** to be proclaimed as a fundamental and absolute right of man! This very false love for man gave life to **“*Gaudium et Spes*,”** or **“The Church in the World of Today,”** **“which will represent the crowning of the work of the Council,”** and which Paul VI will proclaim inspired to the religion of Man, **“center and crown of the world.”**<sup>41</sup>

In his humanist delirium, he further added:

**“Another point we must stress is this: all this rich teaching (of the Council) is channeled in one direction, the SERVICE OF MANKIND, of every condition, in every weakness and need...**

**“Has all this, and everything else that We might say about the human value of the Council, perhaps diverted the attention of the Church in Council toward the trend of modern culture, centered on humanity? Nay, the Church stood Her course, but She turned to man... The modern mind, accustomed to assess everything in terms of usefulness, will readily admit that the Council’s value is great if only because everything has been referred to human usefulness. Hence no one should ever say that a religion like the Catholic religion is without use, seeing that when it has its greatest self-awareness and effectiveness, as it has in Council, it declares itself entirely on the side of man and in his service...”**<sup>42</sup>

And on July 13, 1969, he said:

**“Man reveals himself to us a giant. He reveals himself to us**

**divine not in himself, but in his origin and in his destiny. Honor to man, honor to his dignity, to his spirit, to his life.”**

Yes, for man is the end ...

**“The first step toward the final and transcendent goal which is the basis and cause of every love... Our humanism becomes Christianity, our Christianity becomes centered on God; in such sort that we may say, to put it differently: a knowledge of man is a prerequisite for a knowledge of God.”**

Disconcerting indeed! In his utterance, gone are the Cross of Christ, the baptismal Grace, the gifts of the Holy Spirit, the mysteries of the Faith, treasures of Truth, of Life, of Virtue of the Sole Catholic Church.

We stand before a sort of idolatry of man, such as Christ Himself denounced when He responded to Satan who was tempting Him: **“*Vade retro, Satana!* for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.”**<sup>43</sup>

This brings to mind another address of **St. Pius X**, in his first encyclical:

**“Such, in truth, is the audacity and the wrath employed everywhere in persecuting religion, in combating the dogmas of the Faith, in brazen effort to uproot and destroy all relations between man and the Divinity! While, on the other hand, and this according to the same Apostle (St. Paul), it is the distinguishing mark of Antichrist, man has with infinite temerity put himself in the place of God, raising himself above all that is called God; in such wise that although he cannot utterly extinguish in himself all**

**knowledge of God, he has contemned God's majesty and, as it were, made of the universe a temple wherein he himself is to be adored... Hence it follows that to restore all things in Christ and to lead men back to submission to God is one and the same aim. But if our desire to obtain this is to be fulfilled, we must use every means and exert all our energy to bring about the utter disappearance of the enormous and detestable wickedness, so characteristic of our time: the substitution of man for God.”<sup>44</sup>**

This truly papal line, however, stands opposite to that liberal Paul VI, who, at **Sidney**, on December 2, 1970, stated to the press:

**“We have trust in man. We believe in the store of goodness in everyone's heart. We know the motives of justice, truth, renewal, progress and brotherhood that lie at the root of so many wonderful undertakings, and even of so many protests and, unfortunately, of violence at times... Sow the seed of a true ideal... an ideal to make him grow to his true stature as one created in the likeness of God, an ideal to drive him to surpass himself unceasingly, in order to build jointly the brotherly city to which all aspire and to which all have a right. The Catholic Church, especially since the fresh impulse of “revision” that sprang from the Council, is going out to encounter this very man whose service is your ambition.”**

Paul VI had forgotten what is written in the Holy Scripture: **“Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the LORD.”<sup>45</sup>** And also: **“For without Me, you can do nothing.”<sup>46</sup>**

Paul VI, instead, at the Angelus of February 7, 1971, on the occasion of a space mission, composed a **“Hymn to the Glory of**

**Man,”** as if to confront the Hymn to **“Christ King of the Centuries”**:

**“Honor to man; honor to thought; Honor to science; Honor to the synthesis of scientific and organizing ability of man who unlike other animals, knows how to give his spirit and his manual dexterity these instruments of conquest. Honor to man, King of the Earth, and today Prince of heaven. Honor to the living being that we are, wherein is reflected the image of God and which, in its dominion over things, obeys the biblical command: increase and rule.”**

Here, too, the error of Paul VI is that of the supremacy of the human, his giving value to all that is humanly appreciable, which is of man, **“center and crown,”** whereas the Church of Christ has always been, yes, at the service of man, to the extent of heroism, even, but this, however, always in view of the service to God and of the salvation of souls. Therefore, Paul VI’s anthropocentrism, his orientation upon Man, rather than upon God, brings to mind those insane words of the Pastoral Constitution *“Gaudium et Spes”*<sup>47</sup>: **“All things on earth should be related to man as their center and crown”**; words that certainly do not echo *“Caritas Christi urget nos!”* (The Charity of Christ drives us.)

Regrettably, it seems more than evident that in Paul VI man comes before God, even though, among his citations of the Gospels, he would often repeat: **“Inasmuch as ye have done unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done unto me.”**<sup>48</sup> By all means! But what one does to one’s neighbor must be of a quality acceptable to Jesus. And this cannot definitely be the fondling of man’s pride, boasting of his false science, encouraging his rejection of any dependence on God. He should never have stopped thinking that **his**

**vocation** required him to preach, at all times, the supremacy of the supernatural and the Christian view condensed in the **Beatitudes**: **“Blessed are the poor in spirit... the meek... the peacemakers... they that suffer persecution for justice’s sake...”**<sup>49</sup>

He had no business, therefore, in boasting about being an **“expert in humanity,”** as he qualified himself at the UN (October 4, 1965)... and to say:

**“The mission of Christianity is a mission of friendship among the peoples of the earth, a mission of understanding, of encouragement, of promotion, of elevation, and, let us say it one more time, a mission of health.”**<sup>50</sup>

A **vision** which is far from that of the Gospel, and certainly does not reflect the Words of Jesus: **“Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword”**<sup>51</sup> ... and for this He was always a **“sign of contradiction.”**

But Paul VI manages to aggravate his own utterance:

**“Man... knows atrocious doubts... We have to convey to him a message that We believe liberating. AND WE, WE believe all the more We are authorized to propose it to him because wholly human. It is the message of MAN to man.”**<sup>52</sup>

Here is the **New Gospel, all human, of Paul VI!**

Even speaking about his **“missionary travels,”** he will confess:

**“We Ourselves have no other intention on Our various journeys to all points of the globe. What We try to do with all Our poor strength is to work for the bettering of men, with the aim of**



**bringing about the reign of peace and the triumph of justice, without which no peace is enduring.”<sup>53</sup>**

These are his own words: **“no other intention”** than that of working for human causes; therefore, **not as a custodian of the Faith, but as an “expert humanist!”** His faith, that is, is in man. That is why he regarded Christianity as mere **“humanism.”**

For that reason, after His **“*Ecclesiam suam*”** the Church must not convert anymore, because **“The Church makes herself dialogue...”** a **dialogue** that characterized his Pontificate<sup>54</sup>; a **dialogue** that would no longer consist in preaching the Gospel, but rather in working for a peaceful coexistence between good and evil, between true and false.

**“... A great undertaking, well worthy of reuniting every man of good will into an immense and irresistible conspiracy toward this integral development of man and this concurrent development of humanity, to which We have dared exhort him in the name of integral humanism, in our encyclical ‘*Populorum Progressio*’.”<sup>55</sup>**

Poor Jesus!.. This **“Vicar on Earth”** of Yours must have completely forgotten Your command: **“But seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.”<sup>56</sup>**

But here is another proof of the **basis** upon which Paul VI considered that peace could be established:

**“Let us venture to use a word, which may itself appear ambiguous, but which, given the thought its deep significance demands, is ever splendid and supreme. The world is ‘love’: love for man, as the highest principle of the terrestrial order... Peace**

**is a product of love: true love, human love... If we want peace, we must recognize the necessity of building it upon foundations more substantial... True peace must be founded upon justice, upon a sense of the intangible dignity of man, upon the recognition of an abiding and happy equality between men, upon the basic principle of human brotherhood, that is, of the respect and love due to each man, because he is man.”<sup>57</sup>**

So, the **“more solid basis”** to achieve the peace, is not the respect of God and of His laws, but **“the sense of an intangible human dignity,”** the **“recognition of an abiding and happy equality between men,”** based **“upon the basic principle of human brotherhood...”** And yet, Jesus had said: **“Without Me, you can do nothing.”<sup>58</sup>**

But Paul VI, instead, speaking at FAO (Rome based UN Food and Agriculture Organization), had this to say:

**“As for you, it is man you succor, it is man you sustain. How can you act against him, when you exist for him and could not succeed but with him?”** <sup>59</sup>

Even this remark of Paul VI seems another sort of **“profession of faith”** in man, a repetition of what he had said already at the UN:

**“We bring to this Organization the suffrage of Our recent Predecessors, that of the entire Catholic Episcopate, and Our own, convinced as We are that this Organization represents the obligatory path of modern civilization and of world peace... The peoples of the earth turn to the United Nations as the last hope of concord and peace. We presume to present here, together with Our own, their tribute to honor and of hope.”<sup>60</sup>**

This is the essence of the thought of Paul VI. He believes in the power of man, even atheist man, anti-Christian, and Satanic, as is the United Nations. He believes in him more than he believes in the supernatural means: **Grace, Prayer, Sacraments...** The great hope, to him, is man! He will say it also on 27 January 1974, on the occasion of the canonization of a nun, Thérèse de Jésus Jornet Edibards:

**“... A Saint for our times; that which characterizes, indeed, our times, is the humanitarian aspect, social, and organized, marked by the cult for man.”**

And at Bogotá, before a crowd of peasants waving revolutionary banners, he said:

**“You are a sign. You are an image. You are a mystery of the presence of the Christ (!!). The Sacrament of the Eucharist offers us His hidden Presence, live and real; but You too are a sacrament, a sacred image of the Lord in our midst.”<sup>61</sup>**

Montinian rambling speeches! As in this other euphoric lyricism, commenting on the trip from the earth to the moon. It is another **chant** from which transpires all of **His “cult of man”**:

**“Honor to man; honor to thought; honor to science; honor to human daring; honor to the synthesis of scientific activity and organizing ability of man who unlike other animals (?!) knows how to give his spirit and his manual dexterity these instruments of conquest; honor to man king of the earth and, today, prince of heaven...”<sup>62</sup>.**

But we, instead, shall continue to say: **“Now to the King eternal,**

**immortal, invisible, to God who alone is wise, be honor and glory forever and ever. Amen.”<sup>63</sup> □**

## CHAPTER II

### HIS “OPENING TO THE WORLD” □

It is now clear that the “**new Church**” of Paul VI has broken with the past:

**“The religion of the God who became man has met the religion of man who makes himself God”<sup>64</sup>.**

There is, by now, “**an osmosis**” between the Church and the world<sup>65</sup>; and that is, an **interpenetration**; a reciprocal influence.

And yet, the **Apostle St. John** had written, instead, “**The whole world lieth in wickedness.**”<sup>66</sup> And **Jesus** had said, “**He that is not with Me is against Me.**”<sup>67</sup>

Even **Leo XII**, in His encyclical “*Humanum Genus*,” had written:

**“The race of man... separated into two diverse and opposite parts, of which the one steadfastly contends for truth and virtue, the other of those things which are contrary to virtue and to truth. The one is the kingdom of God on earth, namely, the true Church of Jesus Christ... The other is the kingdom of Satan.”<sup>68</sup>**

But **Paul VI**, throughout his Pontificate, attempted to reconcile these two irreconcilables; hence his contradictions, his ambiguities, precisely on account of his... “**Love to the world.**”

**“We have doubtless intended to talk of the severity of the Saints toward the ills of the world. Many are still familiar with the**

**books of asceticism that contain a globally negative judgment upon the earthly corruption. But it is also certain that We do live in a different spiritual climate, having being invited, especially by the recent Council, to bring upon the modern world an optimistic look for its values, its achievements... The celebrated Constitution ‘*Gaudium et Spes*’ is in its whole an encouragement toward this new spiritual approach.”<sup>69</sup>**

This utterance of Paul VI would seem a clear **invitation to abandon “the severity of the Saints,”** the **“books of asceticism,”** in favor of this **“new spiritual approach,”** regarding **“with more optimism the world,”** in conclusion: to come to a positive judgment **“upon the earthly corruption.”** And this because we live, today, in a **“different spiritual climate.”**

And so, Paul VI’s mentality was one of **“*apertura al mondo*”** (opening to the world). It can also be demonstrated by reading the texts of the **International Seminar**, organized at Brescia, by the “Paul VI” Institute.<sup>70</sup>

**Cardinal Poupard** in His introduction recalled a **question** Paul VI was asking himself:

**“What conscience has the Church matured about Herself, after twenty centuries of history and after countless experiences and studies and treatises?”**

And here is Montini’s own brief answer:

**“The Church is communion. It is the communion of the Saints.”**

“It seems to me – continued Cardinal Poupard – it is in this global vision of the Church, viewed as **mystery of communion**, that lies the

specific contribution of Paul VI to the Vatican II Council and to the elaboration of its *“Magna Charta,”* the doctrinal Constitution *“Lumen Gentium.”* The original contribution of Pope Montini to the Council – continued the cardinal – was that of providing a theological synthesis and conferring a cultural form on the Giovannean project of a Church **“in line” with the new times and “renewed” in her spirituality and in her missionary drive.”**

Even the extraordinary Synod on the Council, in its final report, emphasized that **“the ecclesiology of communion is the central and fundamental idea in the documents of the Council,”** and that **“it cannot be reduced into mere organizational or power-related issues.”**

“Therefore” – continued cardinal Poupard – “the ecclesiology of communion must generate in the Church a style of communion at all levels, between faithful and priests, between priests and bishops, between the bishops and the Pope. **But even for the Church ‘ad extra,’ this style of communion, that is, of ‘opening,’ of respect and understanding, will increasingly characterize the action of the Church toward culture as a whole and toward all men, including non-believers.”**

Even **Jean Pierre Torrell**, of the University of Friburg, in that same **“conversation,”** at Brescia, said **“The Church takes shape, in this manner, as incarnation lasting in time and as communion.”**

Therefore, Pope Montini would have had an **“opening to the world”** in continuous evolution (= relativism), and would have wanted, for this, a new conception of a Church as **“communion” between all men of the Church as well as with those “ad extra.”**

And so, this was the **“original contribution”** Cardinal Poupard saw in the **modernist Paul VI** at Vatican II, with the crucial contribution of the neo-modernists.

Good for us that the above mentioned Cardinal also recalled that Montini was very familiar with the French culture, which much contributed to the formation of such a view of the Church. In fact, Montini had read and studied (?) their books: that of **De Lubac: “Meditation Upon the Church”**; that of **Hamer: “The Church is Communion”**; that of **Congar: “True and False Reform of the Church”**; that of **Maritain: “The Church of Christ”**; etc...

And so, that **“new ecclesiology”** of Montini came, as regular **“foreign merchandise,”** from France. But now, this was nothing new in a Montini who, **unprepared in theology – he never attended a regular class in philosophy, or theology** – adapted so well to his **“modernist mind”** already imbued with those modernist ideas, having long frequented the drawing-room of **Tommaso Gallarati Scotti**, a fiery advocate of modernism in Italy, and having had, for his favorite authors, a **Maritain** of the first hour, with his socialistic conception, a **Bernanos**, subsidizer of the **“international brigades”** during Spain’s Civil War – although aware of the destroyed churches and of the thousands of Bishops, Priests, Monks and Nuns massacred – a **De Lubac**, with his Catholicism reduced into a mere **humanism**, and so forth and so on. Authors, that is, who afford us to say that **Montini’s “choices,”** from priest to Pope, were always consistent<sup>71</sup>!

And so to Paul VI, the **“ecclesiology of communion”** truly was **“as the incarnation lasting in time and as a communion,”** that is, a **continuous evolution** among all of its members and even for those **“ad extra.”**



This concept of **“Church-Communion”** was thus that **“original contribution”** attributable to Paul VI. And yet we would be tempted to observe that never was there less **“communion”** than today, despite the ongoing chatter about it, not seldom out of turn. “There often is, in this holy and marvelous word, a bogus sound, or however ambiguous, which **reveals a use of convenience, and therefore biased.** The **‘communion,’** too, is subjected to polemic. It serves a cause for which it was not born, and before which falls into contradiction. There are the **‘theorists’ of this ‘communion’:** those who distinguish it from the community; those who found it with the community; those who finalize the one to the other.”<sup>72</sup>

More clear and to the point, on this subject **“Church-Communion,”** on this **“new ecclesiology,”** that is, is Cardinal Ratzinger, in his **“Ratzinger Report,”**<sup>73</sup> under the title: **“At the Root of the Crisis: the Idea of Church.”**

Writes the Cardinal:

**“My impression is that, tacitly, one is losing the authentic Catholic view of the reality “Church,” without rejecting it expressly.”**

Now, would it be this, therefore, the **“original contribution” of Pope Montini to the Council?** A shading off the **“mystery” – “communion,”** in the fashion of **Loisy,** the father of modernism, in **“Autor d’un petit livre,”** pretending to be refuting **Harnack...** and as the modernists are still doing today.

**“This term of ‘Church-Communion’ is an ‘error’ – continues Cardinal Ratzinger<sup>74</sup> – an error that led to the practical negation of the authentic concept of ‘obedience’, as the concept of an**

**authority that has her legitimacy in God, is rejected.”**

Hence the Cardinal concludes, by saying:

**“Real reform (or ‘renovation’) is not to strive to put up new facades, but rather (contrary to what certain ecclesiologies think), real ‘REFORM’ is to endeavor in order to part, as far as possible, from what is ours, so that it may better stand out that which is His, of the Christ. It is a truth the Saints knew well, as they in fact reformed the Church profoundly, not by predisposing ‘plans’ for new structures, but by reforming themselves.”<sup>75</sup>**

It is precisely what Paul VI failed to do, when he chose instead to order **“new structures,”** arbitrary, over his eerie conceptions, **which substituted the very “Constitution” wanted by Jesus and then clearly expressed in His Gospels.**

\*\*\*

After which, it is no longer difficult to understand **the reason for his opening toward the modern world and his “sincere love to his time.”** And it is no use asking oneself what Paul VI intended by **“world,”** for he certainly did not intend the material universe, with its sky, its land, plants and animals, etc., but rather, by **“world”** he positively intended the number of men with their own ideas, customs, way of life. Hence **his “opening to the world”** could but be that which, in the New Testament, particularly in **St. Paul and St. John, in the entire Patristic literature and in the writings of all of the Saints** has a pejorative sense, since the world is the **“kingdom of sin,”** as opposed, that is, to the **“Kingdom of God”**; hence the **“spirit of the world”** is in conflict with the **“Spirit of God”<sup>76</sup>**; hence

the “**elements of the world**” are like “**bondages**” keeping man tied down to sin.<sup>77</sup>

Now, if the **devil** is the **prince of this world**<sup>78</sup>, the **Kingdom of Jesus Christ** cannot be of this world<sup>79</sup>; rather, **Jesus is hated by this world**<sup>80</sup>. Consequently, **like Jesus, even the Christian is not of this world**, for in him dwells the spirit of truth the world cannot receive.<sup>81</sup>

That is why, in his First Letter, St. John Evangelist says: “**I write unto you, little children...Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him; for all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.**”<sup>82</sup>

And St. Paul writes: “**But God forbid that I should glory, save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.**”<sup>83</sup>

And I could go on for quite a while, as the word “**world**” in the New Testament is a theological term in the strict sense of the word: “**but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world**”<sup>84</sup>; “**For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our Faith.**”<sup>85</sup> Supernatural Faith, that is! He that lacks it “loves the world” and the world loves him in return.

And Jesus reaffirms this detachment from the world in His prayer to the Father for His Apostles, too: “**I have given them Thy word; and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.**”<sup>86</sup> Thus “**Opening to the**

**world,”** in the theological-Christian language, can only mean **“opening to Satan,” “Prince of this world.”**

Now, this is the very essence of **modernism**. It is the modernists, in fact, who **call for a Church opened to the world through integral humanism**, through the ignorance of the supernatural, through the reduction of the four Gospels and of the whole New Testament into a popular, profane book, almost a myth, born of the conscience of the early Christian communities. What to say, then, of Paul VI, whose mind was certainly immersed in a **“spiritual climate”** quite different from the evangelical one, which reads: **“Woe unto the world because of offences!”**<sup>8</sup>, while, on the contrary, Paul VI did away with that **“severity,”** from those **“negative judgments”** of Christ against the world?

At the outset of the Second Session of the Council, in fact, he had said already:

**“The world must be aware that the Church regards it with profound sympathy, with genuine admiration, sincerely disposed not to subdue it, but to serve it; not to loathe it, but to value it; not to condemn it, but to sustain it and rescue it.”**<sup>88</sup>

Words, these too, which betray the **“mission”** of the Church of Christ, which must place **under the yoke of Christ** the men of this world. And then, is it the duty of Bishops and Priests, perhaps, **“to give value”** to the world? Man is after earthly values on his own, while the **Shepherds of souls must preach, “opportune et importune,”** that those human values are a nothingness before God and eternity, as the Apostle Paul had already preached: **“I count all things... but dung, that I may win Christ”**<sup>89</sup>; that Christ who had said: **“Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath,**

**he cannot be my disciple”<sup>90</sup>.**

Paul VI, instead, goes on to repeat:

**“Out testimony is a sign of the approach of the Church toward the modern world: an approach made up of attention, of understanding, of admiration, and of friendship.”<sup>91</sup>**

A language back to front, therefore, of that used by St. James: **“know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God?”<sup>92</sup>**

Even at the opening of the IV Session of the Council, Paul VI has said:

**“The Council offers the Church, and Us especially, a comprehensive view of the world: will the Church, and will We be able to do anything but to look at the world and to love it? This eye over the world shall be one of the fundamental acts of the Session that is about to begin: once again and above all, love...”<sup>93</sup>**

Words that sound as the capitulation of a Church before the world.

But Paul VI’s excitement grows unchecked:

**“A wave of affection and admiration flowed out from the Council over the modern world of humanity... The modern world's values were not only respected but also honored (!!), its efforts sustained, its aspirations purified and blessed.”<sup>94</sup>**

Now, this **“brimming over with love and admiration”** for the world, whose **“values”** he **“honors,”** goes also counter to the

Scriptures, which say: **“Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.”**<sup>95</sup>

Nevertheless, Paul VI continued to disseminate his **“love” for the world**, presenting the reconciliation of the Church as an absolute evolution, an enrichment of the Catholic doctrine:

**“It seemed interesting to us to note some ‘*moreaux*’ aspects of the Council, which We might define as characteristic, and, consequently, new and modern... One of these teachings, which changes our way of thinking, and, even more, our practical conduct, regards the view we Catholics must hold of the world in which we live. How does the Church regard the world today? This vision, the Council has broadened to us... broadened to the point of changing substantially our judgment and approach before the world. The doctrine of the Church, in fact, has grown richer with a more thorough knowledge of her being and of her mission.”**<sup>96</sup>

Hence to Paul VI, the Catholic approach before the World should **change, broaden**, leaving of Tradition but a few marks of paint. He himself reiterates it:

**“... The framework of this encounter between Church and World remains that of the Gospel. As a consequence, its fundamental theological and moral principles are the traditional and constitutional framework of Christian morality. But, in addition, the Church accepts, recognizes and serves the world such as it presents itself to Her today. She does not reject the formulas of the synthesis Church-world of the past... but... the Church, in Christ and like Christ, loves the world of today. She**

**lives, She speaks, and She acts for it...”<sup>97</sup>**

Here, Paul VI says that, after the Council, the Church recognizes, yes, the eternal conflict between Gospel and World, but, **“in addition,”** She similarly recognizes the **new approach, opposed to Tradition,** and that is to say, **She “recognizes, serves, and loves the world,” “such as the world presents itself today.”**

Double track, that is. Two irreconcilable approaches. All that is left to do is to repeat the verdict of Christ: **“No man can serve two masters.”<sup>98</sup>** That is to say: either one loves Jesus and His Gospel, or one loves the World, loathing Jesus and His Gospel.

But Paul VI goes on to say:

**“This approach (of alliance “Church-World”) must become ‘characteristic’ in the Church of today; here, she stirs and draws in her heart new apostolic energies (!!). She does not seek her own way, She does not place herself outside the existential situation of the world, but She shares spiritually... with her patient and accommodating charity... that charity that ‘bears anything, believes anything, hopes anything, endures anything.’<sup>99</sup>”<sup>100</sup>**

Here you have a typical example of how one could make wicked use the **“Sacred Texts.”** Under the cover that **“charity pardons anything... puts up with anything...”** one invokes **tolerance toward the vices of the world, too.** Not so did Jesus, however, when to the Pharisees, proud and duplicitous, He addressed: **“O generation of vipers... Whitewashed Sepulchers”<sup>101</sup>.** Sure, **God is merciful** toward the man that falls because of his weakness, but then repents, **whereas He is terrible** toward the pride and sensuality persisting in

the world.

Paul VI, instead, in the same Audience, had said:

**“This supposes ‘another mind’, which We may similarly qualify as ‘new’: the Church frankly admits the values proper of temporal realities; She recognizes, that is, that the world holds riches that he realizes in undertakings, he expresses in the realm of thought and arts, that he is deserving of praises, etc., in his being, in his becoming, in his own domain, even if he were not baptized, if he were a profane, a lay, a secular... ‘The Church – says the Council – recognizes all that is good in the social dynamism of today.’<sup>102</sup>”<sup>103</sup>**

Hence, the Church should become **“neutral,”** and, therefore, **“praise the profane, lay, secular world.”** But then, do the severe words of St. Paul: **“If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema”<sup>104</sup>,** still bear any import today? And what consequence carry the Words of Jesus, even graver and more decisive: **“For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?”<sup>105</sup>**

There is matter for reflection. But reflection was also Paul VI’s obligation. And why on earth, then, would he not remember that: **“Woe unto me, if I preach not the gospel!”<sup>106</sup>** of St. Paul?

But, perhaps, to Paul VI, that traditional teaching had become a **negative teaching,** one deserving of discredit.

**“This approach, full of caution and boldness, which the Church manifests today toward the present world, must modify and shape our mind of faithful Christians, still immersed in the**



whirling of modern profane life... We must explain, with much caution and precision, the difference between the positive vision of the worldly values the Church is presenting to her faithful today, and the negative vision, without annulling what of true is in the latter, that the wisdom and asceticism of the Church have so many times taught us with regard to the contempt of the world... But We wish to conclude making it Our own and recommending this optimistic vision the Council is presenting to us, about the contemporary world...”<sup>107</sup>

These are more of his... fraudulent words!

“The wisdom and asceticism of the Church” – said he, in fact – “has taught us, for centuries, a negative vision of the worldly values. Today, while not denying what of true is in that contempt of the world, the Church presents to us a differentiated vision of the world; rather, a positive vision.”

Regrettably, this **obsession of his** became also his **line of pastoral conduct**, as he appointed, for example, the Bishops in consonance with his own mindset. Cardinal Ratzinger confirms it in his book, *“Rapporto sulla Fede”*:

“In the first years following Vatican II Council, the candidate to the episcopate seemed to be a priest primarily **‘opened to the world,’** and, indeed, this prerequisite topped the list. After the 1968 Movement, **with the worsening of the crisis, it was discovered, not seldom through bitter experiences,** that what was needed were bishops open to the world, **and yet concurrently capable of standing up to the world and to its harmful tendencies,** in order to heal them, contain them, alert the faithful against them. **Many bishops have harshly experienced, in their own dioceses, how**

times have really changed in comparison with the not-so-critical (an euphemism?) optimism of the immediate post-Council.”<sup>108</sup>

What then? Wasn't Paul VI, too, supposed to be aware of the irreducible conflict between the two visions of **Christ and World?** And why, then, his stubbornness in continually reiterating that, today, there is instead a blissful alliance between them, almost ignoring that, on the contrary, there are no real values in the **worldly realities** which St. Paul categorically **“counts as dung.”**<sup>109</sup>

Nonetheless, in that **“Conversation”** at Brescia's Paul VI Institute, the continuity of John XXIII's Pontificate and of that of Paul VI, and of the opening to the world was insisted upon. Cardinal Poupard – as we already mentioned – underscored that **“the original contribution of Pope Montini to the Council** was that of providing a theological synthesis (!) as well as **conferring a cultural form upon John XXIII's project of a Church in line with the new times, and renewed in her drive.”**

And the Jesuit father, professor Giacomo Martina, reported that **“Paul VI's concern lies... above all, in emphasizing the element that characterizes and ensures the continuity between the two pontificates: the opening toward the modern world and the sincere love to their own time.”**

Of this **“mens”** there was to be had confirmation in that other Convention, promoted by the Marche Region Institute “J. Maritain” on the theme: **“The Road to Vatican II.”** In representation of the Italian Episcopal Conference,” the then Secretary Monsignor Camillo Ruini attended the Convention. Well, **“The thematic – wrote Baldoni – focused particularly on the figure of Pope Roncalli and on the opening to the world, on the fact that this exceptional Pope**

**had wanted to throw an eye outside the window.”**

**Monsignor Capovilla**, however, saw fit to reveal – for the first time – to **“have seen the face of the Pontiff furrowed with tears, on the verge of his death, because some were affirming that he had set in motion a process that would not have been for the good of the Church”!**

A **“weeping”** which “demonstrates” that Pope Roncalli had not foreseen the negative effects of his decisions, of his apostolic actions (!! ) made without hearing his Secretary of State, cardinal Tardini, or any of the Cardinals responsible for the various jurisdictional Congregations, particularly that of the Holy Office, whereas he paid heed, of preference, to his diviner-counselor, his factious personal Secretary, monsignor Capovilla, so much so that cardinal Tardini came to offer his resignation from his post, and cardinal Siri, then head of the CEI (Italian Episcopal Conference), protested with the Pope for monsignor Capovilla’s unusual intrusiveness and rash behavior, although to no avail.<sup>110</sup>

Paul VI, however, after **“*Pacem in Terris,*”** flung open the doors of the Council to his **“*apertura al mondo*”** (opening to the world). One has only to read **“*Gaudium et Spes*”** to dispel any doubt. **His “love to the world,” his “cult of man,”** were but a counter-altar to the straightforward affirmation of **Jesus, “My kingdom is not of this world.”**<sup>111</sup>

\*\*\*

It was a real utopia his agitated soul, his ambivalent behavior, his obsession of reconciling, at any cost, the Church with the **modern world**, with modern philosophy, subjectivist and immanentist, and

**modern culture**, imbued with subjectivism and immanentism, were nourishing. Surely it wasn't a guiltless action, for it was a path already blocked off by the past Magisterium, with *Mirari Vos* (1832) of Gregory XVI, with the *Syllabus* (1864) of Pius IX, with *Pascendi* (1907) of St. Pius X, with *Humani Generis* (1950) of Pius XII, which firmly condemn all these **apertures** and, consequently, even those false “**restorations**” that suffocated **the perennial philosophy, the Scholastic theology, and the dogmatic Tradition of the Church.**

It is the **new theology** that has determined the crisis that paralyzes the life of the Church, as it is permeated – we repeat with *Humani Generis* – with “**false opinions that threaten to subvert the foundations of Catholic doctrine.**”

It is not easy to fathom his thought, enveloped in a language oftentimes vague and obscure which renders it incomprehensible, though providing “pictures” of apparent respectability, which conceal errors and ambiguities.

What is clear, however, was always **his cult of man, his love for the world**, which nourished his **chimeras**, specifically:

- **Humanity is “marching” toward a new world, toward an ideal society in which freedom, brotherhood, and equality shall reign; in which the perfect respect of Man's Rights, and the Great Democracy shall be achieved, fulfilling the dream of the French Revolution.**

- “**Universal peace**” shall rule, thanks to the principles of natural morals, accessible to all. All that is needed is to stir and foster **the conscience of humanity.**

- **All the forces of the men of goodwill** (including the “reformed” Church) must unite to form this **new world** and this **new ideal society**.

- The Church, however, in this construction of the **worldly paradise**, should have a mere **supplementary** role, as she would be complementing the role of the United Nations. In any case, the means of the natural order would stand above the supernatural order.

But **the glory of God and the salvation of souls** is a theme Paul VI, in his writings and speeches, has nearly forgotten.

**“It is the ferment of the Gospel that has aroused and continues to arouse in man's heart the irresistible requirements of his dignity.”**<sup>112</sup>

Hence to **Paul VI the Gospel seems a mere instrument, almost the pretext** for a sort of world political revolution that must lead to the Kingdom of **Man's Rights**, proclaimed by the French Revolution.

In fact, in an address to the Diplomatic Corps, **Paul VI** had already hinted at his belief:

**“We have trust in human reason... One day, reason must come to be the ultimate word.”**<sup>113</sup>

Luckily, that day shall never come. Yet ever since 1789 this trust in **human reason** is preached. This human reason has been severed from its root, **God**, and placed at the service of the shallows of human nature. That is why any catastrophe is possible.

But **Paul VI, even in this other statement**, said:

**“The Church attempts to adapt to the language, customs, and tendencies of the men of our time, all absorbed by the rapidity of the material evolution and so demanding for their individual particularities. This opening is in the spirit of the Church...”<sup>114</sup>**

**Pius X**, blessed predecessor of Paul VI, on May 27, 1914, admonishing a group of new cardinals from a certain spirit of adaptation to the world, instead, had said, **“We are, alas, in a time in which are all too easily accepted certain ideas of reconciliation of the Faith with the modern spirit; ideas that lead way farther than what one might be led to think, not only toward a weakening, but also toward a loss of the Faith...”** But Paul VI, perhaps, no longer remembered that Christianity has its center in the Cross of Christ... as he followed in the footsteps of **Rousseau**, who affirmed that **“man is good,”** which clashes with the Christian doctrine that affirms **“man was born a sinner,”** hence, as Jesus says, **“None is good, save one, that is, God.”<sup>115</sup>**

How correct, then, is Paul VI’s **“opening to the world,”** steadfast and stubborn to the point of saying that **“... It is our duty to favor the formation of a mind and practice which would best suit the true moral progress of man and society?”<sup>116</sup>**

And yet, even the Protestant theologian Karl Barth posed himself the question, on that **opening to the world**, on the part not only of Protestantism of any chapter, but also of post-Conciliar Roman Catholicism:

**“With the windows opened onto the world – he wrote – haven’t our Protestants, as well as the last Council, gone too far? When too many windows are built and opened, the house ceases to be a house... the concept of ‘Church’ could be broadened to the extent**

that it would fade out into the dim nebulosity of an unconscious Christianity.”<sup>117</sup>

Paul VI, however, continued to pursue a mission rather temporal than spiritual, in order to edify that **New World**, that **ideal society**, that **great universal brotherhood**.

**“All of us, Churches included, are involved in the birth of a new world. God... in His love for man, organizes the movements of history for the progress of humanity and in view of a new earth and new heavens, wherein justice shall be perfect.”**<sup>118</sup>

And again:

**“The Catholic Church urges all of her sons to undertake, together with all men of good will of every race and nation, this peaceful crusade for the well-being of man... in order to establish a global community, united and brotherly.”**<sup>119</sup>

Words to the wind! And a **dream**, his **progress of humanity**, which in reality is ever quaking with revolutionary wars, with all sorts of hatred, as if taking flight from reality and from the Christian duty of carrying the inevitable cross of injustice. **“It is impossible but that offences will come: woe unto him, through whom they come!”**<sup>120</sup> And this because evil, injustice, and suffering, shall always dwell with us. That is why the Church has always preached the extraordinary value of suffering, continuation of the redemption of Christ: **“I fill up that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body’s sake, which is the Church.”**<sup>121</sup>

As for that **“peaceful crusade for the well-being of a new world,”** then, the Cross of Christ should give way to the Masonic movement,

which similarly preaches a global brotherhood.

Therefore, Paul VI insists:

**“Isolation is no longer an option. The hour has come of the great solidarity among men, toward the establishment of a global and fraternal community.”**<sup>122</sup>

Could one not think, at this point: if the whole world has to change, should religion not change, too? **If between the reality of life and Christianity – especially Catholicism – there is disagreement, misunderstanding, indifference, mutual hostility, how could Christianity claim to have retained any influence upon today’s life? Is that why Vatican II called for reforms and revisions?** But why, then, did Jesus say, **“Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away?”**<sup>123</sup> And if that is the case, the Gospel shall always be the same, regardless of world change. And the doctrine of Jesus shall be always **“A sign which shall be contradicted.”**<sup>124</sup>

But Paul VI continued to believe it possible to merge the **pagan world and Gospel of Jesus Christ**. Perhaps he believed that the influence of Christianity depended upon a reformation **in the sense of the world**, even though that will to reform the Church and her doctrine in a manner that would not injure the sensibilities of the world, could signify **apostasy** - change of religion:

**“Know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God.”**<sup>125</sup>

And that, even Paul VI should have known, rather than fancying a Masonic-like humanitarian and social philanthropic organization.



**“The Church, although respecting the jurisdiction of the Nations, must offer her help to promote a global humanism, I mean to say, an integral development of man as a whole and of each and every man... Placing herself at the forefront of social action, She must direct all of her efforts to sustaining, encouraging, and driving the initiatives that operate toward the integral promotion of man.”<sup>126</sup>**

Hence to Paul VI the Church must no longer focus upon the evangelization of the peoples for the salvation of souls, but rather **“spare no effort” toward the promotion of a “full humanism,” possibly taking up the vanguard of the social action.**

The encyclical *“Populorum Progressio”* was precisely a push toward that mindset:

**“The fight against poverty, urgent and necessary, is not enough. It is a question of building a human community wherein men can live truly human lives, free from discrimination on account of race, religion or nationality, free from servitude to other men or to natural forces they cannot yet control satisfactorily. It involves building a human community wherein freedom is not an idle word, wherein the needy Lazarus can sit down with the rich man at the same banquet table.”<sup>127</sup>**

Building a world, that is, wherein every man might live a fully human life.

**“They strive to learn more, and have more so that they might increase their personal worth. And yet, at the same time, a large number of them live amid conditions that frustrate these legitimate desires.”<sup>128</sup>**

Perhaps here, again, Paul VI overlooked Jesus' maxim, when He said, **“It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.”**<sup>129</sup>

But Paul VI's utopia rested upon his faith in man.

**“We have trust in man. We believe in the store of goodness in everyone's heart. We know the motives of justice, truth, renewal, progress, and brotherhood that lie at the root of so many wonderful undertakings, and even of so many protests and, unfortunately, of violence at times. It is up to you not to flatter man but to make him aware of his worth and capabilities...”**<sup>130</sup>

His words induce us to reflect upon the Words of the Scriptures: **“Cursed is the strong man who trusts in man and has set up flesh as his arm.”**<sup>131</sup>

On the contrary, in Paul VI's writings always transpires, between the lines, his profound conviction that **man**, even without the Grace of God, **by his own strength alone**, can improve his human venture, establishing that global brotherhood that would wipe out every war, every poverty, and every injustice. Sure, Paul VI does not deny that God is necessary in this process of improvement of man, but it is clear that his accent is not placed on this point, the only essential one. He puts his emphasis, rather, on the possibility of man as such.

**“When all is said and done, - says he – if man can, at length, do nothing without man, one can (instead) with him, do anything and succeed in anything, so much so that are indeed spirit and heart to first carry off the real victories.”**<sup>132</sup>

Here, too, Paul VI forgets what Jesus said: **“For without me ye**

**can do nothing.”**<sup>133</sup> And yet to him it does not seem to work this way. In his numerous speeches about **peace**, a call to a **universal human conscience**, or to some **principles of natural morals**, is never lacking.

**“Isn’t peace impossible; are man’s powers sufficient to secure it and maintain it? We would refrain, at this time, from offering exhaustive answers to this anguishing question which calls into play the most arduous theses of history’s thinking, to conclude merely with a word of Christ: ‘The things which are impossible with men are possible with God.’<sup>134</sup>”**<sup>135</sup>

Here, too, Paul VI evades the question; **he refuses to say whether or not God is necessary** to world peace. On 1 January 1968, in fact, in his **Message** for the “Day of Peace,” he had said:

**“The subjective foundation of Peace is a new spirit that must animate coexistence between peoples, a new outlook on man... Much progress must yet be made to render this outlook universal and effective; a new pedagogy must educate the new generations to reciprocal respect between nations, to brotherhood between peoples... One cannot legitimately speak of peace where no recognition or respect is given to its solid foundations: sincerity, justice and love in the relations between states... between citizens...; the freedom of individuals and peoples, in all its expressions...”**

So that’s Paul VI’s idea of peace: **a new spirit, a new mind, and a new pedagogy**. And here are the foundations: **to give a new ideological education**.

**“Peace is the logical aim of the present world; it is the destiny of**

**progress... There is need, today... A new ideological education, education for peace... Let us realize, men, Our brothers, the greatness of this futuristic vision, and let us courageously undertake the first program: to educate ourselves for Peace.”<sup>136</sup>**

And furthermore:

**“Before being a policy, peace is a spirit... It forms, it takes hold of the consciences, in this philosophy of life each has to build for himself, as a light for his steps upon the paths of the world and in the experiences of life. That means, dearest brothers and sons, that peace requires an education. We affirm it, here, by the altar of Christ, as We celebrate the Holy [*novus ordo?*] Mass.”<sup>137</sup>**

The light, therefore, guiding man’s steps, is no longer the Christ who said: **“I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness”<sup>138</sup>**: it is no longer this **philosophy of life**, Paul VI wanted. Said he, in fact:

**“One must succeed and banish war; it is human convenience demanding it.”<sup>139</sup>**

Hence man should repress vengeance, sacrifice his egoism, convert his hatred, in the name of this **human convenience demanding it**. Downright ludicrous!

And yet, Paul VI insists:

**“Although difficult, it is indispensable (however), to acquire an authentic conception of peace... Peace is a most human thing. If we seek wherefrom it really comes, we discover that it sinks its roots in the loyal sense of man (!!). A peace that is not born of the real cult of Man, is not essentially a peace.”<sup>140</sup>**

That's it! **True peace** comes from the **Cult of Man!**

**“We wish to give our life a sense. Life is worth the sense we give to it, the direction we impart to it, the end we direct it to. What is the end? It is peace. Peace is a beautiful thing, yet hard... It is the fruit of great struggles, of great plans, and, most of all, it is the fruit of justice: If you want Peace, work for Justice.”**<sup>141</sup>

But if peace is founded on justice, on what is justice founded?

**“Minds must be disarmed if we effectively wish to stop the recourse to arms which strike bodies. It is necessary to give to peace, that is to say to all men, the spiritual roots of a common form of thought and love... This interiorization of peace is true humanism, true civilization. Fortunately it has already begun. It is maturing as the world develops... The world is progressing towards its unity.”**<sup>142</sup>

What an illusion! Is the **world marching toward its unity, today?** Wars are up, conflicts have intensified, guerrilla warfare is drenching peoples in blood...

His **common denominator that ensures a common way of thinking and loving**, is no longer the Gospel of Christ, **“Way, Truth, and Life,”**<sup>143</sup> but that **civilized conscience** that would enforce the **Charter of Man's Rights**.

**“...What is our message? What are needed above all are moral weapons, which give strength and prestige to international law; the weapon, in the first place, of the observance of pacts.”**<sup>144</sup>

Once again Paul VI gives pre-eminence to human means. Let us go back to **his** incredible address of 4 October 1965 at the United

Nations. Was it not, perhaps, **a recital of his Creed in the religion of Man?** Let us read again those **passages** that aroused not a little amazement:

**“Our message – said he - is meant to be, first of all, a moral and solemn ratification of this lofty Institution... We bring to this Organization the suffrage of Our recent Predecessors, that of the entire Catholic Episcopate, and Our own, convinced as We are that this Organization represents the obligatory path of modern civilization and of world peace... The peoples of the earth turn to the United Nations as the last hope of concord and peace. We presume to present here, together with Our own, their tribute to honor and of hope.”<sup>145</sup>**

Every person that had retained a minimal Christian sense, must have protested and criticized that **profession of faith in an Atheist and Masonic Organization**, which Paul VI defined an **obligatory path and last hope of peace ...**

And that, he repeated in **his** other message addressed to U Thant, then Secretary General of the UN, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of that Organization:

**“Once again, on this day, We wish to repeat what We had the honor to proclaim on October 4, 1965, to the audience of your Assembly: This Organization represents the obligatory path of modern civilization and of world peace... If the breeding grounds of violence are always on the rise... The consciousness of humanity affirms itself, with like occurrence, increasingly stronger on this privileged forum where... Men recover their inalienable common trait: the human in man... Thus, We renew our confidence that your Organization would be able to respond**

**to the immense hope of a brotherly global community, where anyone might experience a truly human life.”<sup>146</sup>**

I repeat: **it is a new profession of faith in the UN and in man, whereas the Scriptures tell us: Blessed is that man that maketh the LORD his trust, and respecteth not the proud...<sup>147</sup>**

But there, at the UN, it certainly wasn't Peter who spoke. For Peter, authentic Vicar of Christ, would not **kneel** before the pride of Man, incarnated in that Masonic Organization that intends to run the world without God.

Paul VI, however, continued:

**“Beware, dear friends, that We are ready, today, to deliver you a message of hope. Not only is the cause of man not lost, but also it is in a privileged and safe situation (?!). The great ideas (you may include the Gospel, if so you wish) that are like the beacons of the modern world shall not die out. The unity of the world shall be accomplished. The dignity of the human person shall be recognized in its actuality and not only formally... The unjust social inequalities shall be suppressed. The relations between the peoples shall be founded upon peace, reason, and brotherhood... This is not a dream, or utopia, neither is it a myth: it is evangelical realism.”<sup>148</sup>**

It feels like a dream! A **Pope, Paul VI**, announcing a world without suffering, without Cross! And that would be nothing less than **“evangelical realism.”** The Words of Jesus spring to mind: **“Get thee behind me, Satan:... Thou art an offence unto me: for thou savorest not the things that are of God.”<sup>149</sup>**

Words Jesus told Peter himself, as he did not want Him to suffer the Passion. And comes to mind what St. Pius X wrote in his **“Letter on the Sillon”**:

**“Jesus did not announce for future society the reign of an ideal happiness from which suffering would be banished; but, by His lessons and by His example, He traced the path of the happiness which is possible on earth and of the perfect happiness in Heaven: the royal way of the Cross. These are teachings that it would be wrong to apply only to one's personal life in order to win eternal salvation; these are eminently social teachings, and they show in Our Lord Jesus Christ something quite different from an inconsistent and impotent humanitarianism”<sup>9150</sup>.**

Clear and doctrinal words that crush all of the evanescent sociological follies of Pope Paul VI. □



## CHAPTER III

### HIS “OPENING TO MODERNISM”

St. Pius X, in his encyclical “*Pascendi*” against “**Modernism,**” wrote that the advocates of error were hiding, by now, even inside the Church, “**In the very bosom of the Church,**” and that their “**counsels of destruction**” stirred them “not outside the Church, but **inside of Her;** so much so that the danger lies in wait almost in Her very veins and viscera.”

With the “*Motu Proprio*” of 18 November 1907, Pius X added “**the excommunication to those who contradict these documents**” (encyclical “*Pascendi*” and decree “*Lamentabili*”). And he was addressing the Bishops and Superiors General of all Orders and Institutes.

In 1946, the great P. Garrigou Lagrange, O. P., in his article “*La Nouvelle Théologie Où Va-t-elle?*,” denounced the work of doctrinal corruption amidst the clergy, seminarians and Catholic intellectuals.

He speaks of “typed sheets... distributed... in which were found the most singular assertions and negations about **original sin,** the **Real Presence,** and about all the other truths of Faith (negation of

the eternity of hell, Polygenism...); “a general convergence of religions toward a universal Christ who, all in all, satisfies everyone; the only conceivable religion as a Religion of the future.” It is the essence of today’s ecumenism; to make every religion converge into Christ separated, however, from His Mystical Body, the Catholic Church (in “*Lumen Gentium*,” the light of the Gentiles, of the Pagans, is Christ, and not His Church). De Lubac, author of the “*Surnaturel*,” the most forbidden of the **forbidden books**, and author also of the “*Corpus Mysticum*,” with its dogmatic relativism, explained that repeatedly.

**Vatican II**, under such influence, “has avoided, in its main documents, the use of the term *supernatural*”<sup>151</sup>.

Romano Amerio, too, in his “*Iota Unum*” (chapter XXXV), writes:

**“The Council does not speak of supernatural light, but of ‘fullness of light’. The naturalism characterizing the two documents ‘Ad Gentes’ and ‘Nostra Aetate’ is patent also in its terminology, as the word ‘supernatural’ does not occur in it.”**

Father Henrici, in the magazine *30 Giorni* (December 1991), underscores that the “*Nouvelle Théologie*” (condemned by Pius XII in “*Humani Generis*,” in accord with St. Pius X) “**has become the official theology of Vatican II.**”

This is also confirmed by the fact that the “key posts” in the Church have already been assigned to the modern exponents of the *Nouvelle Théologie*, whose official newspaper is the Magazine “*Communio*,” subsidized by cardinal Ratzinger, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith.

Someone has pointed out that **several theologians, named bishops in recent years, come from the files of “Communio”**; such as the Germans **Lehman and Kasper**; the Swisse **Von Schönbern and Corecce**; the French **Léonard**; the Italian **Scola**; the Brazilian **Romer...**

It must also be noted that the **“founders”** of this Magazine **“Communio,” Balthasar, De Lubac, and Ratzinger, have become cardinals.** Today, to this host of names, can be added the Dominican **George Cottier**, theologian (regretfully) of the **“Pontifical House”**; **Jean Duchesne**, the press-agent of cardinal Lustiger, and the Hegelian **André Leonard** (bishop of Namur and responsible for the Seminary of Saint Paul, where Lustiger sends his seminarians).

I also wish to point to the work: **“Vatican II - Situation and Prospects 25 Years After: 1962-1987,”** in which its author, **René Lateurelle, S.J.,** illustrates the triumph of the **“new theology”** and the favor it received with **Paul VI.**

**P. Martina, S.J.,** at pg. 46, writes:

**“If one cannot certainly talk of excommunications and subsequent canonizations, some great theologians were, however, in those years, made the object of several restrictive measures, only to take on, afterwards, a prominent role among the main Conciliar experts; and they had a thorough influence upon the genesis of the decrees of the Vatican II. Some books, in 1950, were banished from the libraries, but, after the Council, their authors became cardinals (de Lubac, Daniélou....).**

**“Some pastoral initiatives (e.g., worker priests) were condemned and cut short, but were resumed during and after the Council.”**

**“*Humani Generis*”** of Pius XII (1950) was **practically retracted** by **Paul VI**, who brought back into the limelight his own theologians, whom his predecessor had condemned.

With the advent of **Paul VI**, there came into being that **reformist religion** which, by degrees, supplanted the traditional religion. From the loftiness of his Papal See, Paul VI could impose those liberal and pro-Modernist leanings he had breathed ever since his youth, setting off immediately that insane and ruinous process of **experimentation** in the Church, which is but **novelties** supported by the modernists.

I mention briefly Paul VI’s **antithetical parallelism** to the Pontificate of St. Pius X, who had erected **barriers** against Modernism, which Paul VI, however, knocked down with obstinate decision, one after the other.

Here they are:

- **Pius X**, with the Motu Proprio **“*Sacrorum Antistitum*”** (September 1910) had imposed the **anti-modernist oath**; but **Paul VI abolished it**.

- **Pius X** against ecclesiastics who contested **“*Lamentabili*”** and the encyclical **“*Pascendi*”** with the Motu Proprio of 18 November 1907 inflicted excommunication *latae sententiae*, reserved to the Roman Pontiff; but **Paul VI destroyed it**, ruling that he would not hear of excommunications anymore (Why, then, the excommunication of Monsignor Lefebvre?).

- In order to confront that **synthesis of all heresies**, Modernism, **Pius X** had reorganized the **Holy Office** through the Constitution

*“Sapienti Consilio”* of 29 June 1908; but **Paul VI**, with grave insipient counsel, **abolished it**, stating that of **heresies** and widespread **disorders**, **“thank God there are no more within the Church”** (*“Ecclesiam suam”*) and that **“the defense of Faith, now (?!) is better served by the promotion of Doctrine than by condemnation”** (1965). (Perhaps the **promoters of heresies** are not lacking in **doctrine**, other than in **good Faith**? Perhaps the Church is no longer called to the gravest duty of using her coercive power, which Jesus has bestowed upon her, against the obstinacy of heretics?)<sup>152</sup>.

– **Pius X**, in order to protect **catechesis** from the manipulation of the modernists, had wanted a basic catechism, one for the entire Church; but **Paul VI** ostracized **St. Pius X’s catechism**, and **wanted pluralism in the catechesis, too**; and he proved scandalously tolerant of the **heretical “Dutch Catechism,”** making it the archetype of all catechisms, more or less bizarre, which then mushroomed throughout the dioceses of the Church.

And while **Pius X** had foiled the insidious tactic of the modernists – who presented their errors, **“scattered and linked”** – denouncing, with his *“Pascendi,”* those dangerous **novelties** as **“an authentic, well-organized system of errors,”** **Paul VI**, instead, brutally revealed his modernist side, when there came the LXX anniversary of that great Encyclical of St. Pius X, through the mass media (**Vatican Radio** of 4 September 1977 and *Osservatore Romano* of 8 September 1977), which defined *“Pascendi”* as a **“revelation” of modernism, “not altogether historically respectful.”** But Paul VI didn’t stop here! He denigrated the anti-modernist battle of St. Pius X, stating that **“there lacked the knowledge or the will or the respectful courage of reading distinctions and differences in their own reality.”** Hence St. Pius X would have been an idiot and a

pusillanimous charlatan!..

That was thus the “**commemoration**” of that great Pope and Saint, which revealed, however, in Montini’s heart, all his bitterness and his well-known typical modernist imprint. And for that, Paul VI repudiated those wise and inspired documents of Pius X’s as they were “**a rash pruning of sprouts then attempting to grow,**” when, instead, they had revealed the nature of a luxurious **darnel**, rather than that of **sprouts**, which suffocated almost all the good wheat the Church had harvested in the preceding centuries.

- Furthermore: **Pius X**, in order to hinder the advance of modernist rationalism in the Biblical exegesis, had given stability to the **Pontifical Biblical Commission**, wanted by Leo XIII, and, **with the “*Motu Proprio*”** of 18 November 1907, had decreed that

**“All are bound in conscience to submit to the decisions of the Pontifical Biblical Commission relating to doctrine, which have been given in the past and which shall be given in the future, in the same way as to the Doctrinal Decrees of the Holy Congregation approved by the Pontiff.”**

Today, however, this conscience obligation is no more, as **Paul VI** had reduced this **Pontifical Biblical Commission** into a section of the powerless – not to say **useless** – “**Holy Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith.**” The evidence is in the fact that the Congregation has never since issued any **Decrees**.

Moreover, Pius X, in order to shield from Modernism, in the Biblical field, the scholars of Science of the Scriptures, on May 7, 1909 established in Rome the **Pontifical Biblical Institute**. But today, unfortunately – and **precisely because of Paul VI** – this

Institute is a haunt and breeding ground of modernists among the most corrupting in the Church. It is appropriate to recall that, in 1964, **Paul VI recalled to the Biblical [Institute] the Jesuits Zerwik and Lyonnet, whom the Holy Office had condemned and expelled.**

– **Pius X**, in order to ensure a **formation of the Clergy** that would be doctrinally orthodox, promoted the **Regional Seminaries**, and issued scholarly “**Norms for the educational and disciplinary system of Italy’s Seminaries.**” But **Paul VI**, in order to destroy the Seminaries, entrusted the **Congregation for Catholic Education (thus also for the Seminaries)** to the liberal cardinal **Garrone**, who, at the Council, had launched a fierce attack precisely against the Regional Seminaries, and later, as the “Prefect” of that Congregation, shut it down!

And in order to consolidate the ecclesiastical community, **Pius X** had proceeded with the unification of the ecclesiastical laws through the **Canon Law Code** (later promulgated by Benedict XV); but **Paul VI**, shortly after, (thus without any necessity) **called for a “New Code,” which opened up to modernist principles.** And while **Pius X** had staunchly condemned **inter-confessionalism** as it is harmful to the Faith of Catholics and generates indifferentism, **Paul VI, instead, wanted that scatterbrained modernist “ecumenism”** Pius X had already called a:

**“Charity without Faith, quite soft on misbelievers, which opens up to anyone, unfortunately, the road to eternal ruin.”**

But Montini, archbishop at Milan – in 1958 – had said:

**“The boundaries of orthodoxy do not coincide with those of pastoral charity” (?!).**

## Was “pastoral,” then, to him, beyond Faith?

Paul VI has always refused to condemn even those theologians who had gone so far as to deny the divinity of Christ. And it is fact that he let Bishops attack **doctrinal encyclicals** without reproach or removal.

- And it is fact that **he himself** used a **style of non-condemnation** even in important and solemn documents, in which he used restrictive formulas, so as to invalidate any normative character. So did he with his “**Creed**”; so also with “*Humanae Vitae*,” without obligations or punishments.

- For what possible reason **did he demolish**, as it were, prior papal **encyclicals** that had openly condemned **Communism, Modernism, and Freemasonry**?

- What is the reason for **his scandalous passivity before the Dutch schism**, allowing **errors** to spread throughout the Catholic world?<sup>153</sup>

- Why **his inaction**, before the diffusion of so many **heretical catechisms**, before an **ideological pluralism** in forms, ideas, and rites, under the convenient label of **pastoral**, or of **culture broadening**, in order that every truth, every dogma, every certainty might be repudiated; even though in his exhortations, occasionally, he affected to be recalling to order? **Paul VI** not only **always refused to condemn, but also prevented any condemnation**, placing even in high offices true and genuine advocates of heresies, such as, for example, **Küng**, whom he personally defended<sup>154</sup>.

- He never condemned **the heretic Teilhard de Chardin**, whom, on the contrary, he occasionally cited and subtly praised.

- He let the Holy See be challenged upon the most important points



of the Faith, without reactions on his part.

- **He threw away the entire Tradition**, with shrewdness, **destruction** and “**reconstruction**” made in stages, introduced, at first, “*ad experimentum*,” out of special or personal interest, to be soon reconfirmed or promulgated.

- He diminished “**ministerial Catholic priesthood**,” approximating it to the ministry of **Protestant Pastors**.

- **He let seminarians travel to Taizé**, where Protestant and Calvinist cults are also celebrated; and he continued to welcome **their Chiefs**, such as **Schutz and Thurian**, as if they had been authentic **ministers**.

- He allowed many theologians to continue to demolish **ministerial priesthood**, less and less distinguished from the “**priesthood of the laity**.”<sup>155</sup>

- He pushed that **Reform of the Seminaries**, which cries out for vengeance before Christ the Priest.

- He allowed (nay, **he wanted!**) **that the habit be replaced** with civilian clothing, with all the consequent decay.

- He **eliminated the Tonsure, the Ostiariate, the Exorcistate, and the Subdiaconate** (15 September 1972).

- He wanted, categorically wanted, **his Replacement of the Traditional Mass**.

- He let the psychosis of the **woman-priest spread**, although he later had to say that it could not have been (as of yet), letting

cardinals and bishops, however, continue, undisturbed, to publicize that idea.

- He admitted the possibility of accepting **married priests**.
- **He allowed concelebrations of Anglican Pastors** at the Vatican.
- He allowed some Protestants to receive the Eucharist.
- He allowed “**Communion**” **distributed into the hands** and the “**Holy Species**” **placed in breadbaskets and even distributed by girls in miniskirts**.
- He let pass and authorize **open Communions**, that is, that Protestants could participate in the Communion during Catholic Mass, and that Catholics could participate in the **Protestant Supper**.
- **He abolished Latin in the Liturgy**, forcing the use of **national languages** and even **dialects** (eliminating, in this way, **catholicity**), and **similarly ruined sacred music** (we are by now come to the **tomtom**, at St. Peter’s, as well as **rock**), and emptied our churches of all that is sacred, and had the **altars** turned facing the people (counter to “*Humani Generis*”), in the fashion of the tables for the Protestant Suppers.

And thus he turned the Church into a sort of **Political Party**, and turned **religion** into a sort of **stirring Center of integral humanism**, “**as he wanted to build a world wherein every man, no matter what his race, religion or nationality, can live a fully human life.**”<sup>156</sup>

In simple terms, Paul VI’s **religion** became, as it were, the **servant of the world**, since “**religion must be renovated**”... (12 August

1960), since all religions are equal, serving but the purpose of fraternizing in the temporal action.

Hence **Paul VI allowed the demolition of dogmas**, as these were a hindrance to brotherhood. **He allowed the clouding over of the Sacraments and the weakening of the Commandments**, as these were too inflexible. In brief: **he allowed the whole institution of the Church to crumble to the ground.**

### **Utopia or apostasy?**

Idolater of science, or pseudo-science, he substituted them for theology.

That is why he spoke, terrorized, **of the continuous growth of world population**, seconding the Masonic-Capitalist campaign behind **Birth Control**.

- That is why he received doctor Barnhard (the first physician to perform a heart **transplant**) even before studying the moral aspects of this practice.

- That is why he sang the praises to the man on the moon.

- With his **revisions**, with his **adaptation to the world**, he emptied **Seminaries and religious Novitiates**, gave the **Church leftist trade unionist priests**, reduced the message of the **Cross into a vile humanism**. He, in fact, promoted the **revision and modernization of all the Constitutions of Religious Orders and Institutes**, bringing about destruction, disorder, anarchy, and chaos.

- He wrecked every Catholic organization: A.C., FUCI, Oratories, and traditional parish Associations.

- He abandoned the symbol of Pontifical power, the **Tiara** (donated to Milan, then gone lost in the United States).

- He abolished the **Pastoral**.

- He wore, on his chest, the **Ephod of the Hebrew High Priest**.

- He handed the **Insignia of St. James** to the Orthodox.

- He democratized all the institutions of the Church.

- He spread the concept of **democracy** in all of the institutions of the Church, although it [concept of democracy] had been condemned by the past Magisterium (such as **Vatican I** (DS 3115); such as **St. Pius X** in the **Sillon**), thus weakening the **monarchical power, of divine right, in the Church**.

- He introduced **15 women in the Council**, and later on **70 more in the Vatican offices, 7 of whom** in the Holy See's most delicate Office, in direct contact with the Pope.

- He always refused to receive groups of seculars and priests that were faithful to Tradition (thus creating new forms of schism), whereas he always sent his **"Blessings"** to all others, non-traditionalists.

- He always received **Freemasons, Communists, Modernists, protesters and leftists of any kind**.

- He received, without reactions, the movie star **"Cardinale" in miniskirt; and girls in shorts and "hot pants"**; all in a special audience, declaring himself altogether **"Mindful of certain values that you are pursuing: spontaneity, sincerity, liberation from**

**certain formal and conventional ties, necessity of being oneself and live and interpret the issues of one's own times.”<sup>157</sup>**

- He received scandalous **hippies** and **beat singers**, and **pop bands**, in blue jeans, disheveled long hair, ragged T-shirts and coats.

- He received **Marcellino de Santos**, head of the assassins who murdered even a missionary father and the inhabitants of Mueda (Mozambique); and he gave his blessing to the **murderer Cabrol**, of Guinea, and to **Agostinho Neto**, chief of terrorism in Angola, etc.

\*\*\*

All in all, **he made a relentless show of his will of breaking with the Church of Tradition. Even his inconsiderate relegation of octogenarian Cardinals**, forbidding them from entering the Conclave for the election of the Pope, concealed **his mens** of eliminating from the Conclave all those members that would not be favorable to his own line of **revision of his new Church**.

**He imposed the resignation of Bishops, making it mandatory at 75 years.**

- **He** created the **Episcopal Conferences**, without defined power limits.

- **He eliminated major figures** in the Church, placing in many posts of command progressive and liberal-freemason figures.

- **He** abolished many holy days of precept.

- **He** wrote off the abstinence from meat on Fridays.

- **He** opened the way, with his silence, to the obsession of sexual relations in Catholic schools.
- **He** left the doors open to all kinds of protests.
- **He** issued a **Decree for mixed marriages**, without mandating the Catholic Baptism of the sons!
- **He** attempted to abolish traditional **cloistered life**, even though he masked his position with expressions in favor of the same.
- **He** dispatched cardinal **Willebrandt**, as his “Legate,” to the Lutheran Assembly of Evian (September 1970) **to sing Luther’s praises.**
- **He** performed that incredible gesture of throwing himself to his knees and kissing the feet of Metropolitan Melitone, envoy of the Patriarch of Constantinople, Demetrius.
- **He** destroyed the so-called **triumphalism** in the Church, in the name of the slogan: **The Church of the Poor**, which is but a caving-in to the Secular-Masonic-Marxist mind of our times.
- **Under his Pontificate, the Vatican accredited the first ambassadress, Miss Bernardette P. A. Olowo** ( under 28 years old).
- **He blessed the Pentecostals** dancing and howling at St. Peter’s.
- **He**— still archbishop of Milan — opened up the **Secret Archives of the Curia** to the search for documents regarding the “*Monaca di Monza*” [Nun of Monza, featured in Alessandro Manzoni’s novel, *The Betrothed*], on which to base a novel and a film (as if he could not assess the moral harm this would have caused).

- **His** was the clamorous “**absolution**” of Graham Greene’s book, “**The Power and the Glory**,” a longstanding entry in the Index.

- **He** multiplied the **disobedient** in every sector, granting his tolerance to such as the “**ACLI**,” the “**small groups**,” the “**base communities**,” the “**Catholics for Socialism**,” the “**Fourth of November**” movement, the “**worker priests**,” the adherents to the “**Red Christ**” of the Italian Socialist party (PSI); that is, a total landslide to the left.

We conclude that **he himself** ditched all that sustained the Church and Christian Europe: **authority, hierarchy, discipline, family, teaching, Catholic university, regular and secular clergy, parishes. He himself declassified Sacraments, and imposed bogus liturgical reforms.**

In his speeches – even almost edifying – the **new always prevails over the traditional.** But his forte was always to insert, after a witticism or an anti-progressive reasoning, an additional piece encouraging the progressives.

Similarly his hetero-praxis provoked doctrinal change, though not expressed in a doctrinal way.

In conclusion, we narrate this eloquent episode: the nephew of professor Dietrich von Hildebrand, doctor Sattler, **Ambassador to the Holy See**, in July 1968 told the Hildebrands that Paul VI had said to them, “**It is my hope, during my reign, to achieve the ‘reconciliation’ between Catholics and Protestants.**” The Ambassador stood quite troubled. He kept saying, “**He said ‘reconciliation’, not ‘conversion’!**”

\*\*\*

This was the real face of Paul VI. This was **his** Pontificate. Always a **progressive**, upon election he would appear not to have succeeded Peter so much as Judas.

One need only recall his steadfast opposition, at the Council, of the “*Coetus Internationalis Patrum*,” while **He never stopped supporting the liberal Bishops**.

Consider **his immobile silence before the internal demolition of the Church and his fiery perseverance in destroying the Catholic Nations** (Italy, Spain, etc.).

A fine example of immobile silence: When the **divorce legislation** was approved in Italy, Paul VI was in Sydney (Australia). He was promptly informed, and he said **he was expecting it**; he was sorry for the harm it would cause the family, and for the reason that it was in breach of a provision of the Concordat [*which Paul could have enforced!*]. As for **sin**, however, not a single word!

\*\*\*

I could endlessly continue to cite **words and actions** clearly indicative of how authentic a liberal-modernist **Paul VI** had been.

- On June 30, 1968, in order to dispel suspicions as to **his modernism, Paul VI**, at St. Peter’s square, for the closing of the Year of the Faith, made a solemn “**Profession of Faith**, which appeared as the “**New Creed**,” antidote for the “**New Catechism**.”

And yet reading closely his writing, one could see that Paul VI had, yes, taken up the old **Creed of Nicea**, but had also inserted into it



some points of a more recent Catholic doctrine.

There was a burst of enthusiasm for that **“Creed,”**<sup>158</sup> but Paul VI had **prefaced** the text of his formulation of the act of Faith, with **two clarifications**: (1) **that he intended to fulfill “the mandate Christ entrusted to Peter,”** and provide **“a firm testimony of the divine truth entrusted to the Church”** [and it’s high time, too!]. But he put everything back into question, as (2) **he expressly excluded that his Creed was, strictly speaking, “a dogmatic definition.”**

In his own words:

**“... We are about to make a profession of faith, to utter a creed, which, without being a dogmatic definition in the strict sense of the word (!!), and even with some developments required by the spiritual conditions of our time...”**

That is very serious, a deliberate misconception; for **every object-proposition of a “Creed” constitutes “revealed truth, of divine Faith and of Catholic faith,” attested in the Scriptures, in the Apostolic Tradition** (i. e., the two sources of Revelation) **and defined by the Infallible Magisterium of the Church - hence truths of Catholic Faith.**

What then? Was it **his** umpteenth clever action in order to hide his real mind? Was he shielding himself from the critics, since he had failed to condemn the **Dutch Catechism?** (Shortly after, in fact, he had himself photographed together with ill-famed **Dominican father Schillebeeckx, co-author of that ill-famed catechism.**

Be that as it may, a strange silence followed the **“Creed” of Paul VI.** In lieu of a plebiscite of adhesions without reservations, on the

part of the official ruling Catholic world, there was no open and uttered consent.

\*\*\*

What I reported of his **remarks** and **deeds** is more than sufficient, I believe, to dishonor **his Pontificate**, so much so as to make us think of him as of a **novel Honorius**.

Namely, when Pope Leo II confirmed the anathema of the II Ecumenical Council of Constantinople against pope Honorius, he had said only this:

**“With Honorius, who did not, as became the Apostolic authority, extinguish the flame of heretical teaching in its first beginning, but fostered it by his negligence.”**

Now, this imputation can definitely be brought also against Paul VI. Like Honorius, in fact, **he too “fomented heresy through his negligence”** and, perhaps, even worse than pope Honorius, **through his approval**. Yes, for Paul VI continued to see to that **“self-destruction” of the Church**, which he had himself denounced, in spite of being its author, and which he himself had carried forward with those **men of the Church** whom **he** himself had placed and maintained in key positions.

Regrettably, today, we are still suffering those sorrowful years of **his pontificate**, which might be defined one of the worst periods of the long history of the Church. The consequences are there for all to see: **the Faith gone; the true Liturgy destroyed; the Eucharistic cult humiliated; the sane theology in shambles; the Sacraments no longer inspiring trust, for their significance has been distorted; the**

**Mass** that has become a communal gathering; **the Catechism** devoid of dogma; the children themselves that have lost respect for the sacred things; and thousands of them are no longer baptized, because of the quaint ideas of many priests; and **the intercessions for the defunct** are now humbled into a banal and ugly liturgy.

At this juncture, to reform this Church, leprous with heresy and irreverence, what is wanted is a divine intervention, since a true Reformation would have to set out with restoring **the Altar of the Sacrifice** (which is not the **table** of the Protestant **Supper** imposed, by now, even in Catholic churches), **since only from the true Altar comes the unity; and only there the Truth is affirmed, and only thence true Charity spreads out.** □

## CHAPTER IV

### HIS “OPENING TO FREEMASONRY” □

The Catholic Church has always condemned this **Masonic sect**, denouncing its **secrets** in the process.

**Jacques Mitterand**, former Grand Master of the **Grand Orient** of France, made admission of it. In his work, “**The Policy of the Freemasons**,” he wrote:

**“The Catholic Church did not mistake the importance of the event... With the Bull “*In Eminenti*,” Pope Clement XII pronounced, in 1738, the excommunication of the French Freemasons, denouncing the secret that surrounded them and their operations.”<sup>15</sup>.**

After 1738, all of the Pontiffs renewed those **admonitions** and those **sanctions**. Here are their major encyclicals on that theme:

**“PROVIDAS”** of Benedict XIV, of 18 May 1751;

**“QUO GRAVIORA,”** Apostolic Constitution of Leo XII, of 13 March 1820;

**“ECCLESIAM”** of Pius VII, against the Carbonari of 13 September 1821;

**“TRADITT”** of Pius VIII, of 24 May 1829, confirming the previous “anathemas”;

**“QUI PLURIBUS”** of Pius IX, of 9 November 1846;

**“*QUIBUS QUANTISQUE*”** of Pius IX, of 9 November 1849;

**“*HUMANUM GENUS*”** of Leo XIII, of 20 April 1884;

**“*PASCENDI*”** of St. Pius X, of 8 September 1907.

\*\*\*

**Benedict XIV** blessed Monsignor Jouin for his work: **“Against the Sects That are the Enemy of Religion.”**

**Pius XII**, on July 24, 1958, denounced, as the roots of modern apostasy, **Scientific Atheism, Dialectic Materialism, Rationalism, Secularism**, and their common mother: **FREEMASONRY**<sup>160</sup>.

**Pope John XXIII**, in 1960, reminded the Roman Synod:

**“As for the Masonic sect, the faithful must keep in mind that the penalty stipulated by the Canon Law Code (canon 2335) is still in effect**<sup>161</sup>**”**.

The approach of the Church, then, up until Vatican II, was always clear and coherent. The condemnation of Freemasonry was because of its tendency to destroy religious order and Christian social order, even if it presents itself **under the mask of tolerance and respect of the others**. Its real aim, however, is that of rebuilding society on new bases, excluding Our Lord Jesus Christ, in order to achieve a **universal religion**, according to the principle of democracy.

In fact, ever since that sect was able to operate, there were, in France, **five revolutions** (1789-1830-1848-1870-1945), **four foreign invasions** (1815-1870-1914-1940), **two spoliations of the Church; the expulsion of the Religious Orders; the suppression of Catholic**

**schools; the secularization of the institutions (1789 and 1901)...**

And yet, today, one still hears – **irresponsibly!** – that Freemasonry is changed, hence no longer deserving of condemnation. But that is a bogus statement. Even prior to Vatican II, the Roman documents were more than explicit. For example:

**“Freemasonry of the Scottish rite falls under the condemnation issued by the Church against Freemasonry in general, and there is no reason to grant any discrimination in favor of that category of freemasons.”<sup>162</sup>**

**“Since nothing has come about that would solicit a change, in this matter, in the decisions of the Holy See, the provisions of the Canon Law retain their full validity, for any type of freemasonry whatsoever.”<sup>163</sup>**

On January 5, 1954, the **Holy Office** condemned a work by the Grand Master of Austrian Freemasonry. On February 20, 1959, **the Plenary Assembly of the Argentinian Cardinals, Archbishops, and Bishops**, published a **Statement** recalling the formal condemnation from **Pope Clement XII through to St. Pius X**, and underscored that Freemasonry and Marxism pursue one and the same aim. Unfortunately, with Vatican II, the Church modified her course. The freemasons themselves were prompt to observe it:

**“The Council of Rome (Vatican II), in its second session, lets transpire a great diplomatic movement of the Church in the direction of Freemasonry. The approach of the Church does not surprise the French Freemasonry’s leaders, who had long been expecting it and believed to have traced, rightly or wrongly, in the works of M. Alec Melior and in the conferences of father**

**Riquet (a Jesuit), the preliminary efforts toward a preparation of the spirits.”<sup>164</sup> 8**

This **new direction** of the Church was confirmed by freemason **Yves Marsaudon<sup>165</sup>** in his book published at the conclusion of the Council:

**“When Pius XII decided to direct personally the very important ministry of Foreign Affaires, Monsignor Montini (sent to Milan) did not receive the purple. It thus became, not canonically impossible, but traditionally difficult that upon the death of Pius XII he could accede to the Supreme Pontificate. But then came a man who, like his Precursor, called himself John, and then it all began to change...<sup>166</sup> If some small islands still exist, not too distant, in the mind, from the times of the Inquisition, they would be forcibly drowned in the high tide of Ecumenism and Liberalism, one of the tangible consequences of which shall be the lowering of the spiritual barriers still dividing the world. It is with all our heart, we wish the success of John XXIII’s ‘revolution.’”<sup>167</sup>**

And so, the **new approach of the Church was the change of course of Vatican II**, guided formerly by **John XXIII**, and subsequently by **Paul VI**, which adopted **ecumenical and liberal positions toward Freemasonry**, even though for **250** years they had been utterly different.

How is it that with Vatican II there was such an **opening to Freemasonry**, when Freemasonry had always been judged the **number one enemy** of the Catholic Church? But any who followed the **progress of Vatican II** should know that **liberal and modernist Bishops**, not a few of whom belonged, if not *de facto*, ideologically

to Freemasonry, had taken over the Council.

The **fact** was patent, for example, in cardinal **Achille Liénart**, Bishop of Lille, who ruined Vatican II from its very first session, causing all of the Pontifical Commissions that had already prepared all the work and study plans, to be rejected. He acted under command of the **Masonic occult power**.

And yet, in France, it was no secret that his political ideas were redder than his habit, and that he also belonged to Freemasonry; that his **“initiation”** had taken place in 1912; that he **“received the light”** at Cambrai; that he frequented three Lodges at Lille and one at Valenciennes, and then two more at Paris, **“reserved to parliamentarians”**; and that, in 1924, he was elevated to the 30<sup>th</sup> degree and made **“Kaddosh Knight.”**<sup>168</sup> As one can see, a *curriculum vitae* of a **freemason bishop-cardinal** that is quite eloquent as to the weight he had in the Council.

Therefore, it would not be out of place if we also recall his cry, on his deathbed: **“Humainement, l’Eglise est Perdue!”**<sup>169</sup>

But then, what can we say of Paul VI as to that **Jewish-Masonic occupation** that, throughout his Pontificate and during Vatican II, was, as it were, flanked by that dark shadow that dominated it?

From many parts and at different stages, in an objective manner, even violent, at times, was insinuated the idea that even Paul VI – according to experts of heraldry and nobility –descended from converted Jews,<sup>170</sup> and would have been **initiated** by the **B’nai B’rith Lodge**, and that he always entertained good relations with Freemasons and Jewish circles.<sup>171</sup>



Be that as it may, in order to shed a cloudless light upon this aspect of Paul VI's personality, it would be appropriate to examine closely **some of his doings and utterances.**

Specifically:

1) Paul VI's **obituary** by former Grand Master of *Palazzo Giustiniani* [Rome headquarters, Grand Orient of Italy], Giordano Gamberini, published in "*La Rivista Massonica*" magazine reads:

**"To us, it is the death of him who made the condemnation of Clement XII and of his successors fall. That is, it is the first time – in the history of modern Freemasonry – that the Head of the greatest Western religion dies not in a state of hostility with the Freemasons! ... For the first time in history, Freemasons can pay respect at a Pope's tomb, without ambiguity or contradiction."**<sup>172</sup>

In fact, having considered the events that took place under Paul VI's Pontificate (such as to cause him to say that **self-destruction** of the Church was afoot), one can perceive how it had been possible that Freemasonry could pay such a bombastic tribute to Paul VI.

2) In a lengthy letter of the renowned Paulist **Don Rosario F. Esposito**, on "*La Rivista Massonica*" Magazine, to former Grand Master Gamberini, it is said:

**"... Dear Gamberini, I appreciated, even in its Cartesian aloofness, your editorial on the death of the Pope."**<sup>173</sup>

And he continued revealing some **facts**, spanning from 1950 to 1959, and **which see Paul VI as a protagonist.** Namely: between 1948 and 1950, the then Monsignor Montini said to father **Felix A. Morlion**, OP, founder of "*Pro Deo*":

**“Not a generation will pass and, between the two societies (Church and Freemasonry), peace shall be sealed.”<sup>174</sup>**

(But is the Church a... **“society?”**). In any case, that **peace** was ratified by the Holy Office in July of 1974, with a **letter: “The letter of the Holy Office to cardinal Krol bears the date of 19 July 1974, thus the terms of “a generation” have been perfectly met.”<sup>175</sup>**

That **Letter** was of **cardinal Seper**, Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, with which, other than announcing a **new Canon Law Code**, he invited the Bishops, in dealing with the Freemasons, to follow the example of the North-European Bishops, which consisted in the **permit** granted by the Scandinavian and Finnish Bishops (and tolerated by the Vatican) to the Protestant freemasons converted to Catholicism, to retain their status of freemasons.

Here is that text of the Danish, Norwegian and Swedish Bishops, published on the Official Bulletin of the Norwegian Episcopate, **“Sankt Olav”** of June of 1967:

**“The Scandinavian Episcopal Conference has decided, after lengthy and careful reflection, that the Bishops may allow, individually, the members of the Masonic Order of our Northern Nations wishing to embrace Catholicism, to be welcomed in the Church without renouncing their active membership in Freemasonry.”<sup>176</sup>**

As one can see, this concession was in open contrast with **Canon 2335 of the *Codex Juris Canonici***, which established:

***“Nomen dantes sectae massonicae aliisve eiusdem generis***

*associationibus quae contra Ecclesiam vel legitimas civiles potestates machinantur, contrahunt ipso facto excommunicationem Sedi Apostolicae simpliciter reservatam.”*

(Persons who have themselves enrolled in the masonic sect, or in other associations of the same kind which plot against the Church or the legitimate civil powers, incur ipso facto excommunication reserved simply to the Apostolic See).

In that Letter, besides, father Esposito recalls – in support – **other facts of Paul VI’s in favor of Freemasonry**. Like the following:

**Paul VI “was not afraid to recognize that in the Church there had been concessions to excessive diffidence” toward the Rotary Club, an institution linked to Freemasonry<sup>177</sup>.**

Further to what father Esposito wrote, we could add more significant **facts and remarks as to the mens and conduct of Paul VI with regard to Freemasonry**.

- In a Masonic magazine it is said that **the Grand Master Gamberini**, on the very day of the announcement of Montini’s Papal investiture, said: **“Here is our man!”**

– **Carlo Falconi**, writes in a book: *“... et j’ajouterais que l’information que m’a communiqué comme certaine un “trente troisième degré,” par ailleurs digne de foi, selon laquelle Montini serait inscrit dans une Loge maçonnique, m’a toujours laissé très perplexe”<sup>178</sup>.*

– **In a private letter**, written by a freemason friend of the renowned French writer, **Count Léon de Poncins**, an authority on Masonic issues, this passage appears: **“...With Pius X and Pius XII,**

**us freemasons could do very little, but, *avec Paul VI, nous avons vencu!***” No need for translation!

–That Vatican II had also been controlled by **liberal-freemasons** has been proven by the **fact** of the **freemason cardinal Liénart**, as we already noted.

A head of Freemasonry, Minister of State of the Supreme Council of the Scottish Rite in France, Mr. **Marsaudon**, in his book: **“Ecumenism From the Perspective of a Freemason of Tradition,”** speaking of all **Pope Montini** had done, wrote: **“One could really speak of a Revolution that from our Masonic Lodges has spread out magnificently, reaching the top of St. Peter’s Basilica.”**

Was it not, perhaps, **his Liturgical Reform**, that foreseen by the **freemason Roca** in 1883? **“The divine cult – had written Roca – in an Ecumenical Council shall undergo a transformation that will put it in harmony with the state of modern civilization”**<sup>179</sup>.

And why did **Paul VI lift the censures**<sup>180</sup> **on Freemasonry**, thus allowing the laity to join it (if at the discretion of one’s own Bishop)? And what right had he to do that, **after more than 200 documents of the Magisterium had condemned it?**

And so it was that the **Grand Master Lino Salvini**, in an interview on the eve of the assembly of the Grand Orient (18 March 1978), could say, **“Our relations with the Vatican are excellent.”**

- And why was a portrait of Pius IX... freemason, with an accompaniment of moral insults (his alleged illegitimate sons, etc.), left in display at Palazzo Braschi, in Rome, while no one, **neither the Secretary of State, nor the Vicariate of Rome, nor the *Osservatore***

**Romano**, ever reacted or protested? Even cardinal Poletti, to whom I myself wrote a vibrant letter, did not even deign me a reply.

– **Thus Freemasonry, in Paul VI’s Church, was by now extremely visible, both in the black lists and in the actuation of programs in a strict Masonic style.**

- And how many **Masonic laws** have entered the Church under his Pontificate: **divorce, abortion, separation between Church and State, degradation of Seminaries and Religious Congregations, parity of women**, and so forth and so on.

And while he **always** refused to receive the **Catholics of Tradition**, he continually welcomed the **members of the Masonic Lodges**, like, for example, those of the **Jewish Masonic Lodge of the B’nai-Brith**; like those of *L’Alliance Israélite Universelle*, which aims at achieving the union of all religions into one.

Now, the identity of views of this **Masonic scheme** can be observed in the **Masonic schemes of the UN, of UNESCO**, as well as **in his encyclical “Populorum Progressio”** Paul VI, in fact, speaks of a **world bank** backed by a **world Government**, which would rule thanks to a **synthetic and universal religion**.

And on August 9, 1965, in regard to **Judaism, Islam, and Christianity**, Paul VI had to say:

**“They are three expressions (?!) professing an identical monotheism, through the three most authentic avenues...”**

And again:

**“Would it not be possible that the name of the very same God,**

**instead of irreducible oppositions... generate a possible agreement... without the prejudice of theological discussions?"**

Sure it would be possible! **So long as Christ Son of God** is kicked out of the picture (for He does not exist in other religions), **along with the Holy Trinity.**

- And what to say, then, of **his religion of man**, which he relentlessly advocated, if not that it is **a distinctive Masonic concept?**

And let us recall, once again, his **visit to the UN** (one of Freemasonry's highest places), where, before reciting before the Assembly **his humanist address** (which any other freemason might as well have uttered), **Paul VI walked into the Meditation Room, the Masonic sanctuary**, at the center of which stands **an altar for a faceless God.** Now, Paul VI had to know that that **chamber of meditation** was... a **Masonic Lodge.**

\*\*\*

But there are countless **facts** witnessing to **his** explicit collaboration with Freemasonry.

- During his journey to the Holy Land (1954), on the Mount of Olives, at Jerusalem, he embraced the Orthodox Patriarch **Athenagoras I, freemason of the XXXIII degree.** Then, on the eve of the closing of Vatican II, the pair lifted the mutual **excommunications** launched in 1054.

- On May 19, 1964, Paul VI constituted the **Secretariat for Non-Christians**, and so **Observers** and **Delegates** of the various non-Christian religions could enter the Council. At the Fourth Session,

they already numbered 103.

- Later on, Paul VI would give **his pastoral and his ring to the Burmese Buddhist U'thant**, Secretary General of the UN.

- And on **November 13, 1964**, he would remove the **tiara** (the **triregno**) on the altar, definitively renouncing it. **A gesture that was the objective of the French Revolution**, and which brings to mind the words of the freemason Albert Pike:

**“The inspirers, the philosophers, and the historical chiefs of the French Revolutions had sworn to overthrow the CROWN and the TIARA on the tomb of Jacques de Molay.”**<sup>181</sup>

However, this gesture of Paul VI was but the exteriorization of that which he had already manifested on 7 December 1965, at the conclusion of Vatican II, in the homily in which he said:

**“Secular humanism**, revealing itself in its horrible anti-clerical reality has, in a certain sense, defied the Council. **The religion of the God who became man has met the religion - for such it is - of man who makes himself God**. And what happened? Was there a clash, a battle, a condemnation? There could have been, but there was none. The old story of the Samaritan has been the model of the spirituality of the Council. A feeling of boundless sympathy has permeated the whole of it.”

Now, apart from the **Samaritan** that has nothing to do with it (the Good Samaritan stooped compassionately over a human being and not over a religion), here, instead, one can but remark that **the religion of man who makes himself God is that same religion of Freemasonry**, as the Grand Master of the **Grand Orient of France**

Jacques Mitterand had clearly expressed, in one of his speeches:

**“Teilhard de Chardin has committed the crime of Lucifer, for which the freemasons have been much reproached by Rome: in the phenomenon of humanization, or, to use Teilhard’s formula, of the Noosphere, that is, in that mass of consciences enveloping the globe, it is man that stands at the forefront. When this conscience reaches its apogee, the Omega Point – as Teilhard says – man is such as we wish him to be, free in the flesh and in the spirit. Thus Teilhard has elevated man to the altar, and, worshipping him, he could not worship God.”**<sup>182</sup>

Man who makes himself god, therefore, commits Lucifer’s sin; he follows, that is, the counsel of the ancient Biblical serpent: **“You wi**

**ll be as gods,”** and thus he learnt the rebellion to God. Now, that, in a nutshell, is the content of the philosophy of the **Jesuit heretical theologian (?!) Teilhard de Chardin, sectarian freemason of the Martinist Order.**<sup>183</sup>

It must be noted that **this Jesuit heretic was one of the “masters of Vatican II,** through, in particular, his disciple **De Lubac,** who, although banished by Pius XII,<sup>184</sup> was reintegrated by John XXIII, who even called him as **consultant** at the Council. Paul VI, then, in closing the Thomist Congress, “in the hall of the Chancery, insisted that de Lubac speak of Teilhard de Chardin.”<sup>185</sup>

At this juncture, we also recall what the **Paulist father Rosario Esposito – author of reiterated professions of Masonic faith –** wrote in his book: **“The Great Concurrences Between Church and Freemasonry,”** where, in the biographical index, he informs us that among the protagonists of the **bilateral dialogues** between exponents



of the Church and Freemasonry, which took place between 1966 and 1977, was the **Salesian Don Vincenzo Miano**, secretary of the **Secretariat for the Non-believers** and author of a book titled: **“The Secretariat for the Non-believers and Freemasonry.”** Now, Don Miano participated in all those dialogues, **“illustrating, afterward, the reached positions to the Holy Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith and to Paul VI in person, who followed and encouraged these meetings”**<sup>186</sup>.

No wonder, then, if **Paul VI wanted**, in the Executive Committee for a **Concordant Bible**, also the **Grand Master of the Grand Orient of Italy**, professor **Gamberini**, who was among the founders of the **Gnostic Church of Italy**, in which he holds the position of bishop, under the pseudonym of Julianus. Now, the **Gnostic Church** is the **Satanist church**, officially founded, in France, in 1888, by the freemason **Jules Doinel**.

And what to say of **Paul VI** when, on March 23, 1966, he put on the finger of **Dr. Ramsey, laman and freemason**, Anglican archbishop of Canterbury, **his new conciliar ring and then imparted**, together with him, the **blessing to those present?**

And what to say when, on June 3, 1971, **he received in a public audience, at the Vatican, members of the Masonic Lodge of the B’nai B’rith, the most powerful Masonic Lodge, restricted to Jews?**

And how to explain that, through cardinal Bea, the freemasons managed to obtain, at the Council, the **Decree on Religious Freedom**, and exulted at the victory of **false ecumenism and collegiality? Paul VI’s** relentless, stealthy action had met their hopes: the advent of **democracy in the Church**, and, through it, the

so much yearned-for realization of a **universal religion**, which was then set off with the mortgaging, syncretistically, of the **Ecumenical Movement of Assisi**.

One further evidence lies in the words of Cardinal **Franz König**, who, closing a Convention, at Prague, on **The Operative Alliance Between religion and Science**, said:

**“The best forces of humanity must converge toward a new cosmopolitanism, which cannot be realized without a rediscovery of the spiritual values, capable of leading humanity toward an harmonious communal living.”**187

Indeed, is the **Masonic presence**, perhaps, not distinctly visible, by now, even in the **Ecumenical Movement** and in the structures of the **World Council of the Churches**?

But to those familiar with the **Gnostic principle at the base of Freemasonry**, the intrusion of Freemasonry in each and every “Church” will certainly not come as a surprise.

In England, for example, the early statutes of the **Mother Lodge** were the work of an ecclesiastic, and ever since **Anglicanism and Freemasonry** have been enjoying a perfect marriage. But also the totalities of the **Protestant Monarchies** were, and still are, **Masonic**. As **Masonic** are the **Slavic Monarchy** and the **Orthodox Churches**.

**And what about the Catholic Church?**

- The **philosopher Augusto Del Noce**, commenting on the topicality of Benson’s “**Lord of the World**,” wrote:

**“(Catholicism is) re-incorporated into Masonic ecumenism, and in**

this sense **Freemasonry** can present itself, today, and so it does, as the most moderate of secularisms: Catholicism is not persecuted, but, in fact, **re-incorporated**. Under certain conditions, **a Catholic rite section may well subsist in unitary ecumenism.**”

In fact, the infiltration of Freemasonry even in the ordinary ecclesiastical structures has been ongoing for many years now, as the renowned (pro)-mason, **the Paulist father Rosario Esposito**, also affirms:

“...Brothers active in organized Catholic groups, heading diocesan and regional groups of laymen active in Catholic Action, in Scoutism; and Brothers enjoying the full confidence of the Bishops, to the point that, in some cases, they proactively collaborate in the drafting of documents and Pastoral Letters, ... Other collaborations are carried out in the operation of Catholic and mixed institutions, such as educational institutes, hospitals, clinics, management of Charities and Philanthropic societies, which, from time immemorial, and for recent constitution, include, in their executive Committees, **the presence of the bishop and of managers of structures traditionally chaired by a freemason.**”<sup>188</sup>

Of this friendship between Paul VI and Freemasonry, let us see, as a sample, his official reception of a representation of the Jewish Freemasonry of the B'nai B'rith on 3 June 1971, in which he addressed them as **“My dear friends.”**

Is it credible that Paul VI ignored that the Jewish Freemasonry of the B'nai B'rith, in the United States, was (and still is) all-out to wipe out any trace of Christianity from the institutions?<sup>189</sup>

– On November 28, 1977, a dispatch of A.T.I. (*Agenzia Telegrafica*

*Giudea*, or Jewish Telegraph Agency) informed that **The Conference of the Catholic Bishops and the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith (ADL) announce the establishment of a common work group devoted to examining the issues relating to the faith of the Jews and of the Catholics.**<sup>190</sup>

- And on May 7, 1978, A.T.I. announced that on the coming May 10, **Paul VI would be receiving the representatives of the B'nai B'rith**, bearing a 16-page **document** concerning the “Holocaust.”<sup>191</sup>

Freemasonry had thus not only entered the **grass-roots-Church**, but also the echelons of the **Vatican**, with both clerics and laymen. The siege is “**closing-in round the throne of the Pope.**”<sup>192</sup>

But that was nothing new. The penetration had been in progress for almost two centuries. John Paul II, for example, attributed the Pontifical suppression of the **Company of Jesus** to the doings of Freemasonry.<sup>193</sup> That means the **enemies of the Church** have always found the gates of the Vatican quite more than ajar.<sup>194</sup> And that is admitted even in the high spheres.<sup>195</sup>

**Father Raimondo Spiazzi**, so writes, on the subject:

As to the Conclaves of the future, **Siri** used to say one should pray in order to obtain the grace that the prospective participants be truly free from any partisan influence and influx, not only of an ethical and political nature, but even social. **And that no sect lay its hand onto these [Conclaves]! He referred to Freemasonry**, which he claimed to know, through direct confidences, received from the affiliated, and to know the schemes through which Freemasonry attempted to tighten its grip on men and organs of the Vatican (he did not refrain from suggesting names), and threatened to extend its grip onto the

Conclave. Perhaps it was also on the account of that, that he proposed abolition of the secret: that all take place in the light of day!

**Pope Albino Luciani, too, was aware of the Masonic danger**<sup>196</sup>. The Pope himself was quite polemic with the IOR [Institute for Religious Works; financial arm of the Vatican], at a time the *Corriere [della Sera]*, Italy's major newspaper] was in the hands of the IOR, and the P2 [outlawed P2 Masonic Lodge, of Grand Master Licio Gelli] chose its directors.<sup>197</sup> Naturally, however, the IOR could not have acted without the guarantee of the Secretary of State.

Regrettably, **even the public and repeated admission of the Grand Master Salvini as to the current affiliation to Freemasonry of various High Ecclesiastics** fell on deaf ears.

In another **letter** to Giordano Gamberini, (then Grand Master of Italian Freemasonry), **Don Rosario Esposito** says, **“a series of Paul VI's decisions are an indiscriminate opening toward Freemasonry.”**<sup>198</sup>

And **counsel Mario Bacchiega**, of Rovigo, professor of History of Religions at a Roman faculty (and running a broadcast for a regional TV, explaining ideals and rites of the **Sons of the Light**), asked **“what reliable testimonies exist as to the affiliation of ecclesiasts to Freemasonry,”** replied, **“I saw many clergymen at the Lodge, and never of the low clergy: they were always people of high office.”**<sup>199</sup>

Speaking of Vatican II, counsel **Mario Bacchiega** affirmed twice – in December of 1962 and in November of 1963 – that **the bishop of the Mexican diocese of Cuernavaca, monsignor Sergio Mendez Arceo**, intervened, pleading that **excommunication of freemasons**

be dropped, as “by now there were many ecclesiastics affiliated.”<sup>200</sup>

And the former Grand Master of the Grand Orient of Italy, **Giuliano Di Bernardo**, in the *Corriere della Sera* of March 23, 1991, had said, “We will react to the attacks of the Pope; we have high Prelates in our midst.”

\*\*\*

At this point the truthfulness of “**Pecorelli’s List**” [Mino Pecorelli, director of OP (*Osservatorio Politico Internazionale*, or International Political Observer) Magazine, murdered for unveiling covert political and criminal schemes involving high ranking politicians, freemasons, prelates, business, and organized crime] should come as no surprise. Even “*Panorama*” Magazine of August 10, 1976, carrying its own list – pretending to sell it as unreliable – does not hesitate, however, to state, “**If the list were authentic, the Church would be in the hands of the freemasons. Paul VI would be altogether surrounded by them. Nay, they would have been his great electors and would then have directed him in his most important decisions during these 13 years of pontificate. And, prior to that, it would have been they who pushed Vatican II Council onto the path of reforms.**”

All true – one would say – if one consider that the said **list** includes the names of two Cardinals (**Villot** and **Casaroli**) who have been **Secretary of State of the Holy See**; it also includes that of another cardinal (**Poletti**) whom **Paul VI appointed Vicar of Rome**, that is, as his own representative in the government of that Diocese.

And what to say, then, when that list also features as affiliated to

Freemasonry other **most authoritative Prelates, such as cardinals Baggio, Suenens, and others?**

Let us note, here, at least the most important of Paul VI's collaborators.

### **1st - Monsignor Pasquale Macchi**

Paul VI's personal Secretary from 1954 to 1978. His name is included in the Pecorelli's List, among the **alleged freemasons**, with each **entry** well detailed: **Affiliation:** 23/4/1958; **Registration:** 5463/2; **Monogram:** MAPA.

### **2nd - Cardinal Jean Villot**

Of his affiliation to Freemasonry I will talk, in detail, also in chapter VII of this book. He was for long years **Paul VI's Secretary of State, and later, up until his death** (March 9, 1979), **John Paul I's and John Paul II's**. His name was also published in the monthly **Lectures Françaises**, among other ecclesiastics affiliated to Freemasonry. The Cardinal wrote a letter to the director of the Magazine, denying **any contacts at any time with Freemasonry**. But it is the typical denial every affiliate is bound to, especially when of the higher grades. But, as always, the truth will out. Even for him, therefore, for he was betrayed just after his death, resurrecting among his things also a book titled: **"Life and Perspective of Traditional Freemasonry,"** by Jean Tourniac, Grand Orator of the Grand National Lodge of France. **On the book title page, appear two dedications, scribbled out to his name:** one, of the author himself; the other, of the Grand Master of the same Lodge.

That, too, is another **evidence** of what **General G. Leconte**, of the

French Secret Services, and **officer Masmay** (see chapter VII) had stated to me; namely, **even the parents of the freemason cardinal Villot were freemasons of the Rose Cross Lodge.**

After all, his theological positions and his ideals were always in the sphere of the various cardinals and bishops that appear in the list of **Pecorelli's *Osservatorio Politico* (OP) Magazine**, which also reports his **data: Affiliation: 6/8/1966; Registration: 041/3; Monogram: JEANNI.**

### **3d - cardinal Agostino Casaroli**

He, too, appears in Mino Pecorelli's list, with these **entries: Affiliation: 28/9/1957; Registration: 41/076; Monogram: CASA.**

The Paulist father Rosario Esposito, in his book: **“The Great Concurrences Between Church and Freemasonry”**<sup>201</sup> records that Casaroli, on October 20, 1985, on the occasion of the celebrations of the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the United Nations, held, at St. Patrick's Cathedral, in New York, **“a far-reaching homily,”** whose contents **“confirm that the concurrences between Church and Freemasonry may be considered actually achieved.”**<sup>202</sup>

That Cardinal Casaroli is a **freemason** is also proven by **his excessive praise** of the Jesuit, heretic, and freemason Teilhard de Chardin, in an unspeakable **letter** he sent, on behalf of the Pope, to monsignor Poupard, rector of Paris' *Istitut Catholique*, on the occasion of the celebration of the centenary of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's birth. The Grand Master of the Grand Orient, Jacques Mitterand himself, in an address to the General Assembly of the Lodge held at Paris from 3 to 7 September, 1967, had claimed to Freemasonry the merit of Jacques Mitterand's publications, and had



openly said, **“one fine day, there sprang up from their ranks a genuine scientist: Pierre Teilhard de Chardin,”** underscoring that **“the ideas of the Jesuit Teilhard coincide with those of Freemasonry.”**

Only a **freemason** could have written **such a Letter, giving body to an heretic apostate** - mediocre scientist, mediocre philosopher, and mediocre theologian, – who, to a Dominican friend (who had thrown away the habit), had manifested his plans of **renovation of the Church in a neo-modernist key.**

**Counsel Ermenegildo Benedetti**, former Grand Orator of the Grand Orient of Italy (thus **number two**, behind the Grand Master – then **Lino Salvini** – of Italian Freemasonry), **also offered further evidence** of Casaroli’s affiliation to Freemasonry. In fact, on the weekly, *OGGI* of 17 June 1981, speaking to the **“Brothers”** he had declared, **“It was said of monsignor Bettazzi, of monsignor Casaroli (...). Let there be no doubt about it: that was not mere talk; that was ‘confidential information’ we at the top of Italian Freemasonry used to exchange.”** (I would have you note that **“not mere talk,”** but authentic **“confidential information”**).

Finally, **in confirmation that cardinal Casaroli is a freemason, I can note that even John Paul II admitted it.** In fact, on October 15, 1984, I received the visit of an archbishop (with his secretary), close collaborator of the Pope. Among other things, he told me he had shown the Pontiff my article, **“The New Concordat (in Chiesa Viva n° 145), whose first signatory was in fact cardinal Casaroli.** Now, the Archbishop told me he had remarked to the Pope that my article emphasized cardinal Casaroli’s inclusion in the Masonic lists. The Pope, then, three times pounding his fist on the table, cried out, **“I know! I know! I know!”**

#### **4th – cardinal Ugo Poletti**

**Vicar of Rome, thus Paul VI's representative in the government of the Diocese of Rome.** He also appears on Mino Pecorelli's **list of alleged freemasons**, with well detailed **entries: Affiliation: 17/2/1969; Registration: 43/179; Monogram: UPO.**

#### **5th - cardinal Sebastiano Baggio**

He, too, is enrolled in the Masonic lists<sup>203</sup>, with detailed **entries: Affiliation: 14/8/1957; Registration: 85/2640; Monogram: SEBA.** He was Prefect of the **Congregation for the Bishops**, in charge of appointment of new Bishops, in spite of his alleged affiliation to the Masonic sect, hence he could flood dioceses worldwide with affiliates to Lodges, or pro-freemasons.

#### **6th - cardinal Joseph Suenens**

**He too appears in the Pecorelli's list**, with detailed **entries: Affiliation: 15/6/1967; Registration: 21/64; Monogram: IESU.**

Please note, moreover, **that he was a most authoritative exponent of *Pax Christi***, an organization in which political-social commitment entirely submerges religious commitment. It is evident from its manifest on disarmament of May of 1982, wherein God, Jesus, the Virgin Mary, and the Saints are not even mentioned, while the whole discussion is hinged on the prospective of that **World Government**, or **Universal Republic** Freemasonry has been seeking since its inception, as it is seen in **Anderson's Constitutions of 1723**, fundamental text of the whole Masonic sect.

On September 24, 1970, Suenens had already held a conference, at a Masonic gathering, organized by the Jewish High Freemasonry of

the B'nai B'rith, in which he had brought the Church closer to that Masonic sect which the Church had always anathematized.<sup>204</sup>

It is no secret that **he was also one of the great electors of Paul VI,**<sup>205</sup> who promptly appointed him a **Moderator of the Council.**

Cardinal Suenens, for the election of Paul VI – preceded, propitiated, and decided – attended a sort of **pre-Conclave**, held at Grottaferrata, [on Rome's outskirts near Castelgandolfo, site of the Papal summer retreat] in the villa of Umberto Ortolani, well-known member of Licio Gelli's P2 Lodge.<sup>206</sup>

**Congressman Andreotti**, in his book, *A ogni morte di Papa* [], speaking of that gathering, recounts that one of the participants told him, **more or less seriously, that the canonical majority was already wrapped up.**<sup>207</sup>

### **7th - Archbishop Annibale Bugnini**

**Paul VI put in charge of the implementation of the Liturgical Revolution, him** whom Pope John XXIII had kicked out of the Pontifical University. But Paul VI called him back, appointing him First Secretary of the *Concilium ad exsequendam Constitutionem de Sacra Liturgia*, and, afterwards, Secretary of the **Congregation for the Divine Cult**. But when a **Cardinal produced evidence of Monsignor Bugnini's affiliation to Freemasonry,**<sup>208</sup> Paul VI was forced to send him away from Rome (but why not dismiss him?) dispatching him as *pro-Nuncio* to Teheran (Iran).

In order to understand who this **monsignor, freemason** and revolutionary of the Liturgy, really was, I would have you read what *Avvenire* magazine – **“Religious Information”** (of 24 February

1973, p. 5) reported: “(...) **Two ceremonies (Mass for the students of the Catholic schools, and Mass of the youth)... also destined to remain an example of liturgical experimentation, carefully studied and correctly implemented: first, through sacred dances and an *anaphora* prepared for the occasion; then, through the accompaniment of an authentic ‘pop’ band. After attending the two liturgies, monsignor Annibale Bugnini, secretary of the Congregation for the Divine Cult, said it had been the culminating point of the celebration; a great example of a solution for the last of the issues the liturgical movement must resolve: the recovery to liturgy of a traditional exterior sign of the sacred, such as is dance, and the employment of new instruments and chants, fitting the mind of the youth of today.”**

**It was and is a Masonic scheme, destined to become a sad and distressing reality.**

### **8th - Archbishop Paul Marcinkus**

He was President of the *Institutio Opere di Religione (IOR)*. He is also listed among the **alleged freemasons** on Pecorelli’s List, with entries: **Affiliation:** 21/681967; **Registration:** 43/649; **Monogram:** MARPA.

He was involved in obscure financial dealings, in very close collaboration with Freemasonry.<sup>209</sup>

\*\*\*

For reasons of space, the names of the Prelates affiliated to Freemasonry reported here are not exhaustive. The names that appear in the ranks of Paul VI’s command greatly exceed those cited. Here it

will suffice to name two more, of major significance: cardinals **König** and **Liénart**.

### **9th - Cardinal Franz König**

This **freemason cardinal** was archbishop Vienna, where he was **Primate**. He underwent two **legal proceedings, both of which recognized his affiliation to Freemasonry**. (He was acquitted only for the reason that Freemasonry in Austria is legally recognized).

A German writer, E. K., **could prove, in court, the affiliation of cardinal König to Freemasonry**. Had his been a false accusation, the court would have sentenced him to a year in prison for **perjury**; on the contrary, there was not even a fine.<sup>210</sup>

Even the Catholic newspaper “DRM,” through its director, Benedikt Günther, spoke of that **lawsuit** the Cardinal had filed against that German teacher and writer, E. K., who, however, **“could prove cardinal König’s affiliation to Freemasonry.”** But the director also wrote that on April 18, 1967, another writer had already informed the Cardinal of a scandal in the parish church of Vienna-Hetzendorf, in which there were three blasphemous emblems, painted by order of a freemason of high degree, but that the Cardinal never answered that letter in over ten years. However, that Director of “DRM,” in his **registered letter**, reiterates that, in that **Proceedings** against the Cardinal **“evidence has been forwarded of Your affiliation to the Masonic Lodge”**... whereas against that writer no condemnation was issued. And he wraps up his letter inviting cardinal König, for the salvation of his soul, **“immediately to leave the Masonic Lodge.”**

Another evidence of cardinal König’s affiliation to **Freemasonry**

may be traced in his **greetings** to the Convention of Assisi, on 22 August 1988. The inventor of that **Peace Council** was the representative of the **New Age**, Heizsafrer, who looks forward to the advent of a **world religion**, which is indeed the Masonic scheme.<sup>211</sup> Freemason cardinal König sent **his greetings** to that Convention. It must be noted that the **true Peace** of cardinal Köenig lies in the *Nuova Spes*, which provides for a **New International Order**. A **peace** which corresponds to the Masonic image of the **new man**.<sup>212</sup>

Even the **official historian of Italian Freemasonry, professor Aldo Mola, points to König as a Freemasonry member** – based on information from a **very high and very well informed dignitary from Palazzo Giustiniani** – as a member of a covert Roman Lodge<sup>213</sup>.

The following may also be accounted as further very serious evidence against him: that **he**, together with the Grand Master Delegate of Austrian Freemasonry, **Dr. Kurt Baresch**, was the promoter of the Commission that approved the **Declaration of Lichtenau** of 5 July 1970, drafted by **Rolf Appel**, member of the **Senate of the Grand United Lodges of German Freemasonry**. It was elaborated and undersigned by a Masonic-Catholic mixed Commission. It sets out with an entreaty to the **Grand Architect of the Universe**, that is, to the god of Freemasonry, and it concludes looking forward to the revocation of the countless condemnations issued by the Catholic Church against that sect, particularly of the Canon Law Code's canons of 1917, which provide for the **excommunication** of freemasons.

Finally, one must not forget that, at the Council, it was cardinal König who recommended to the conciliar Fathers **finally to take into consideration the ideas of Teilhard de Chardin on evolution**.

## **10th - cardinal Achille Liénart**

He appears as **freemason** in various lists, as in **Introibo** of July 1976 and in the Italian weekly *Il Borghese* [The Bourgeois]. He was initiated into Freemasonry at Cambrai in 1912, and in 1924 he was elevated to 30<sup>th</sup> degree of the ancient and accepted Scottish rite.

**The freemason Monsieur B.**, (healed at Lourdes on 19 July 1932; with the healing recognized also by the *Bureau des Constatations* on 18 July 1933) narrated that, **at the time in which he frequented the Lodges, he used to meet there with cardinal Liénart.**

It must be known that it was cardinal Liénart who on 14 October 1962, during the First Session of Vatican II, sparked the rebellion against the study and work plans prepared by the various Commissions of the Roman Curia, rejecting even the names the Curia had proposed for the composition of the various Commissions.<sup>214</sup>

Cardinal Liénart was also one of the chiefs of that organized group of Northern European conciliar Fathers of a liberal bent, who took control of the Council, steering it toward those new and unexpected shores which are still destroying the Church.

**It is quite understandable, therefore, that that freemason cardinal, on his deathbed, had exclaimed: “Humanly speaking, the Church is lost.”**<sup>215</sup>

\*\*\*

At this juncture, perhaps one will ask oneself whether the authenticity of those **Masonic lists** had been or not verified, for it would be disconcerting that Freemasonry, condemned and execrated by the pre-conciliar Church from time immemorial, could, today,

after Paul VI, come to acquire such enormous power – even though still occult and uncontrollable – over the entire Catholic Church. Thus before wrapping up our theme on the opening of Paul VI to Freemasonry, it is opportune that we spend a word upon the elements in our possession in order to corroborate the authenticity of those **lists** which were the object of so many discussions.

First of all, it is opportune to pause on the question of the **secret of that Freemasonry sect**, for Freemasonry has always been and still is a **Secret Society**, whose doings are carried out unbeknown to all, and whose members remain surrounded by the most rigorous mystery. That has been demonstrated, of late, even by the publicized occurrence of the P2 Lodge, which enlisted people of the most diverse and contradictory labels, both political and ideological. Hence it is pure simple-mindedness to affirm that the P2 was a “**deviated**” Lodge, when the official historian of Italian Freemasonry, professor **Aldo Mola** in person, in an **interview to *Il Sabato* magazine** of 26 December 1992, affirmed that the P2 “**was not a deviated lodge, but it was necessary to sacrifice it so it would not be discovered that true Freemasonry was a secret Society.**”

Having clarified that, we can move on to the reliability of the principal **list** which appeared in “**OP**” (*Osservatorio Politico Internazionale*) Magazine of 12 September 1978, thus subsequent to that which came out on *Panorama* Magazine of 10 August 1976.

Hence, we point out:

**1st** – that some cardinals requested clarifications as to the lists, and that Paul VI was forced to comply, entrusting the task to **Monsignor Benelli**, who, in turn, passed the task over to Carabinieri General **Enrico Mino**.<sup>216</sup> He, on the basis of the investigations, expressed his



conviction that the list was reliable.<sup>217</sup> **Cardinal Siri**, too, used the service of general Mino, in mid 1977, for investigations on *Panorama* Magazine. Unfortunately, the general passed away on October 31 that year, in the Calabria region, on mount Rovello, in more than suspicious circumstances,<sup>218</sup> carrying with him to the grave the result of his investigation. There remain, however, some **mysterious telephone calls in which Licio Gelli** (Venerable of the P2 Lodge) **spoke of the succession to general Mino**, prior to the General's tragic accident.

**2nd - Pecorelli's List** found credit even in the Vatican, where a young employee – nephew of a (well known) ecclesiastic (father P. E.) – had handed a series of **delicate documents** to Monsignor Benelli, then Substitute Secretary of State, who made him swear **“that he was not lying about so grave a matter.”**<sup>219</sup> Some photocopies of those **documents** were also in the possession of cardinal **Staffa**.<sup>220</sup>

**I had assurance of this fact from a cardinal of the Curia,**<sup>221</sup> who later also gave me some photocopies of those same documents.

**3d - the Card Numbers**, reported on the **Pecorelli's List**, confer a more than credible spin, since Pecorelli was a member of the P2 Lodge (and thus in the know of secret things), but also for the reason that, with that list, he had just invited the scarcely elected Pope Luciani to a rigorous control, with the intention of offering a valid contribution to the transparency of the Catholic Church herself.

In any case, that **list** should have sparked off either a shower of denials or a purge in the ecclesial ranks. On the contrary, not a single **denial** was to be had. As for **purges**, the newly elected Pontiff did not have the time, perhaps **even because Pope Luciani, who had**

**manifested his intention of having a hand in the issue of the IOR and thus involve the list of alleged Prelates affiliated to Freemasonry, too, passed away in circumstances and ways as yet unknown.**<sup>222</sup> What is more, **Mino Pecorelli, the author of that list, was gunned down a few months later, on March 20, 1979; hence, with him were buried all other secrets concerning the Masonic sect in his possession.**

One could ask: why is it that **all of the listed in that Masonic list** have never come together in order to deny that public denunciation, complete with detailed **entries** (Affiliation, Registration, Monogram), **asking the courts for a clarifying investigation, at least on the graphological analysis of the acronyms at the foot of the documents?** How not recognize, then, that that lack of denials and prolonged silence are more than eloquent as they take on the value of circumstantial evidence of the greatest import?

The only one to be removed from office was – as we noted – monsignor Bugnini, the main author of that revolutionary liturgical reform that upset, in a Lutheran form, the bi-millennial rite of the Holy Mass, but it was only after the presentation to Paul VI of the **evidence of his belonging to the Masonic sect**, that he was sent away from Rome and dispatched as pro-Nuncio to Iran.

However, **another serious corroboration of the Pecorelli's list** appeared also in the weekly *OGGI* of 17 June 1981, already mentioned, under the title: **“Salvini Confided to Me Names of People Above Suspicions.”** It is an interview of counsel **Ermenegildo Benedetti**, of Massa Carrara, former Grand Orator of the Grand Orient of Italy, and thus number two of Italian Freemasonry. Now, in that interview, He said: “It was being said of **monsignor Bettazzi, of monsignor Casaroli, of cardinal Poletti, of**

**father Caprile**, writer of *Civiltà Cattolica* magazine, and of **bishop Marcinkus**, the man of the Vatican finances, the so called Banker of God. About these people the buzz had been around since 1970. **Let there be no doubt about it: it was not mere talk; it was confidential information we at the top of Italian Freemasonry used to pass on to one another.”**

I would have you note:

**1st**, that the names uttered by him **are all to be found in Pecorelli’s list;**

**2nd**, that they were not **voices**, but **“confidential information,”** recurrent in the high spheres of Italian Freemasonry. Now, **no Prelate involved has ever come forward to sue the high Masonic dignitary**, despite the wide diffusion, on a national scale, of that weekly.

\*\*\*

The theme of our investigation may as well stop at this stage, at the **mole Pecorelli**, who was able to infiltrate the archives of the **Grand Orient** and subtract those confidential documents.

Having outlined, in this way, the boundaries of our work, we may also comprehend the question that, certainly, will spring up in many minds: **If such was the situation of 1976-78, who, then, was Paul VI to hand the Church over to so little worthy a staff of Cardinals and Bishops, radically different from those who preceded them?**

Here, it would come natural to say: **no comment!** To me, however, that election of Paul VI brings to mind other elections of Popes, such

as that of Pius IX, upon whom the Masonic sect had placed vague hopes of reconciliation with the **new ideas**. What did happen, instead, is well known. Pius IX, instructed by his own experiences, and, above all, enlightened by the divine light, through his **Syllabus** reduced **Liberalism**, that is, **Masonism**, into dust. Upon his death, however, Freemasonry believed the hour had come for their revival and their triumph over the Church. The freemason **Leone Gambetta**,<sup>223</sup> when, on February 20, 1878, Leo XIII was elected, thus wrote to a friend: “This shall be a great day. The **peace** coming from Berlin, and, perhaps, **the reconciliation with the Vatican**. The new Pope has been elected: He is that elegant and sophisticated cardinal Pecci, bishop of Perugia, from whom Pius IX had attempted to snatch the tiara, naming him Camerlengo. This Italian, more of a diplomat than he is an ecclesiastic, has survived all the plots of the Jesuits and of the foreign clerics. He is Pope, and the name he took of Leo XIII seems to me the best of omens. I greet this event loaded with promises. He will not break away openly from the traditions and declarations of his predecessor, but his conduct, his acts, and his relations will be more meaningful than his words, and if he does not die too soon, **we may hope in a convenient union with the Church.**”

The next day he wrote another letter: “Paris, 22 February 1978 – I am infinitely grateful to this new Pope for the name he dared to take: he is a holy opportunist. Could we cut a deal? Who knows? As the Italians say.”

But **Leo XIII did not die too soon**. God granted him 25 years of reign, and the Masonic sect had to postpone that **convenient union with the Church**. In fact, Leo XIII, on four different occasions, steadfastly confirmed **Pius IX’s Syllabus**, and truthfully said of himself, “**Our struggle has not only the defense and integrity of**

**religion as an objective, but also that of civil society, and the restoration of the principles that are the foundation of peace and prosperity.”**

Freemasonry, however, always hoped in a speedy reconciliation with the Church. **On the Masonic Magazine “Acacia”** of September 1903, out came an article of **F. Hiran**, titled: **“The Death of Leo XIII,”** in which he **invoked a Pope who would “undo the ties of dogmatism stretched to the extreme, who would not pay heed to fanatical theologians and accusers of heresies, who would let the exegetes work as they pleased, who would recommend and practice tolerance toward the other religions, who would not renew the excommunication of Freemasonry.”**<sup>224</sup>

But Freemasonry was to be disillusioned again, for the hand of the Holy Spirit never appeared so evident as in the election of Pius X.

Unfortunately, the underlying maladies of the Church of Vatican II had long been around: the temptation of **Protestantism**, of **Marxism**, and of **Modernism**, was already in the subconscious of many Catholics; Vatican II would create the necessary conditions in order that these tendencies would come to light and be retained as a new orthodoxy.

Using the colorful expression of **cardinal Heenan**, Vatican II became a sort of **ecclesiastical safari**; to others, instead, it was the long awaited occasion, and they, well organized, were able to **hijack** it in the wanted direction. The German group, then, with their allies and with a **blitzkrieg** tactic, continuously pulverized and demoralized their adversaries, skillfully using pressure groups. Thus the majority of the Fathers gave in, often involuntarily, not to be branded of **“Passatism”** by the mass media, all hostile, by now, to Tradition. In

any case, the conciliar documents, rather than the work of the Bishops that signed them, were the work of the **experts, the fifth column of modernism**, whose main concern was **ecumenism at any cost**.

And thus came Vatican II, whose ambiguous texts will cause the **Anglican observer Gregory Baum** to say, “**The Council has, therefore, admitted that the Church of Christ is something wider than the Roman Catholic Church; and the other Protestant observer, Oscar Cullmann**, “**All of the texts are formulated so as not to shut any door, and will not present in the future any obstacle to discussions among Catholics, nor to the dialogue with non-Catholics, as it was customary, with the dogmatic decisions of the previous Councils.**”

Only in this neo-modernist light the *opera omnia* of Paul VI during and following the Vatican II, ought to be seen. □ □

## CHAPTER V

HIS OPENING TO UNIVERSAL DEMOCRACY □

And thus man, to Paul VI, is above anything else; that is why he and his texts betray more keenness in defending man's rights rather than God's. He confuses humanism with Christianity. The Christian religion unquestionably more than any other is ordered to the best for man, but she teaches, **in the first place**, the love of a God who has given His life for man, but for man's eternal salvation.

Paul VI, on the contrary, predicts the advent of a peaceful society, thanks to the establishment of a **conscience of humanity**, by way of natural means; which is a **real utopia with a taste of heresy**, since man, since **original sin**, is less inclined to good than to evil: egoism, cupidity, vengeance, hatred, wickedness of all kinds, hence it can be but utopia, this fancying a society in which all men love one another, respect one another, all the more if the respect for the **Rights of God** is not inculcated prior to all else.

That elementary, fundamental truth Paul VI continuously chose to ignore, ever accenting **human rights**, echoing the French Revolution.

A **new Christianity**, therefore, but one unable to generate the **Charity** the World needs.

Now, do the Pope and the Bishops ignore the consequence of this **cult of Man**? Don't they know how many and which crimes have been committed, in the aftermath of that Satanic French Revolution, precisely in the name of **Human Rights**? Have they forgotten that it was revolutionary France that put Europe to the sword, claiming in this way to **liberate the oppressed peoples**?

Naturally, the **Charter of Human Rights** contains also some worthy things; yet these are not the brainchild of the Revolution, since they existed already in the Gospel. In any case, those writings

contain a perverse ideology, serving Man as a supreme being, and excluding any Right of God, and God Himself.

That is why Pius IX said,

**The French Revolution was inspired by Satan himself. Its goal is the destruction of the building of Christianity.**<sup>225</sup>

However, even **the principles of Liberty-Equality-Fraternity are false**, not in themselves, but because they are not subordinated to God and to His laws. They could be held as valid only by alienating oneself from the spirit that has dictated them, from the spirit that animates them, from the spirit that applies and manifests them, cunningly confusing the true with the false and the false with the true.

The **Declaration of 1789** claimed that **the will of the sovereign people** replaced the will of the **SOVEREIGN GOD**; claimed that **human laws overcome divine laws**; that **natural rights supersede supernatural rights**. **Human Rights** were to replace **Jesus Christ's eternal Rights**.

Hence, in conscience, a Catholic must absolutely distance himself from these principles of the French Revolution, and cannot accept the spirit that dictated them, nor their interpretation, nor their application.

**Paul VI held a different view. He regarded the Charter of Human Rights as the modern version of the Gospel.**

St. Pius X had written:

**“...They fear not to draw between the Gospel and the Revolution blasphemous comparisons.”**<sup>226</sup>



**Paul VI** filled his entire Pontificate with a relentless preaching of **Human Rights**, both of individuals and Nations.<sup>227</sup>

**“Something new was being perceived – said he – They were live ideas, concurrences between the great principles of the Revolution, which did nothing but appropriate some Christian concepts: fraternity, equality, progress, desire of elevating the unprivileged classes. Hence, all this is Christian; and yet it had borne, then, an anti-Christian sign, secular, anti-religious, tending to misrepresent this part of the evangelical heritage, aiming at developing human life in an elevated and noble sense.”**<sup>228</sup>

It is not an **“anti-Christian sign,”** but rather an **anti-Christian spirit** that has appropriated Christian concepts in order to turn them against God.

Deplorably, the Conciliar Constitution, **The Church in the Modern World**, reads:

**“The Church, by virtue of the Gospel committed to her, proclaims the rights of man; she acknowledges and greatly esteems the dynamic movements of today by which these rights are everywhere fostered.”**<sup>229</sup>

After that **false conciliar assertion**, this other assertion of **Paul VI** at Manila came as no surprise:

**“I feel the obligation of professing, here, more than anywhere else, ‘Human Rights,’ for you and for all the poor of the world.”**<sup>230</sup>

It would appear that, to **Paul VI**, to profess the **“Gospel”** or the

**“Human Rights”** are one and the same thing. And he went on:

**“The Church firmly believes that the promotion of ‘Human Rights’ is a requirement of the Gospel, and that it must occupy a central place in her ministry.”<sup>231</sup>**

**A requirement of the Gospel?** But where in the Gospel, is a text – at least one! – ever to be found encouraging the claim of **human rights?**

But Paul VI goes on:

**“In her desire to convert fully to her Lord, and in order better to fulfill her ministry, the Church intends to manifest respect and care of ‘Human Rights’ within herself.”<sup>232</sup>**

How odd! Paul VI affirms that, in order to **convert fully to the Lord** and that **better to fulfill her ministry**, the Church must take **care of the Rights of Man**, whereas **St. Paul Apostle**, speaking of his apostolic ministry, wrote, **“For I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified.”<sup>233</sup>**

Sure, Paul VI is not St. Paul Apostle, nor did he share with him a common view. In fact, **he continued to identify evangelization with the defense of Human Rights.** Said he:

**“In light of that which we perceive of our duty of evangelization, and with the strength of our duty to proclaim the Good News, We affirm our own determination to promote ‘Human Rights’ and the reconciliation in the entire Church and in the world of today.”<sup>234</sup>**

Let us recall, then, what **Leo XII** wrote, on 8 December 1892:

**“Every familiarity should be avoided (...) with those who hide under the mask of universal tolerance, respect for all religions, and the craving to reconcile the maxims of the Gospel with those of the Revolution.”**

But Paul VI ignored that voice of the Magisterium, too, and thus said:

**“Peace and Human Rights - such is the thought with which, We hope, men will commence the coming year... This message of Ours cannot lack the strength that comes to it from that Gospel of which We are minister, the Gospel of Christ. It, too, like the Gospel, is addressed to everyone in the world.”<sup>235</sup>**

Even on the occasion of the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the **European Convention on Human Rights**, Paul VI said:

**“In order to promote peace and carry out a moral reconstruction, in this post-war Europe, with her sores still open, respect of ‘Human Rights’ is of the utmost importance...”<sup>236</sup>**

Now, no one can doubt that the **human means** be the sole of real interest to Paul VI. **“Of the utmost importance,”** for the **“moral reconstruction of Europe,”** is not the Gospel, said he, but **Human Rights**, which are based:

- **upon the cult of a Freedom** (that takes no account God and duties toward Him);
- **upon the myth of Equality** (source of continuous injustices and violence);
- **upon the dream of a universal Fraternity** (gained at the price

of concessions and betrayals, and through mere human means).

Note that the **Charter of Human Rights** has produced only conflicts, upheavals, disputes, and wars, since man, separated from God, shall always dream of claiming **rights rather than his duties**.

In any case, **Paul VI** should have known that the sole means to check such upheavals is to CHRISTIANIZE THE WORLD, giving it Jesus Christ, preaching His Gospel, administering His Sacraments, through which comes to us the indispensable grace of God.

Instead, in Maritain's "**Integral Humanism**" we read that **Universal Democracy**, or the **City of the World**, must be founded upon **Conscience**, and must be based upon the **Charter of Human Rights**, that is, upon the laws of the modern city.

**Human Rights** would thus be the transposition, in a modern key, of the **Evangelical Message**.

Paul VI affirms it, too:

**“This edifice which you are constructing – said he in his address to the United Nations - does not rest upon merely material and earthly foundations, for if so, it would be a house built upon sand; it rests above all on our own consciences.... Today, as never before, in an era marked by such human progress, there is need for an appeal to the moral conscience of man.”**

But whence is to come the moral strength to sustain **moral conscience**, if not from **divine Grace**?

But Paul VI, in one of his **Wednesday Allocutions** (8 December 1965), **would represent his theory of conscience**, considered as

moral strength, onto which **religious sentiment** is engaged, saying:

**“It is in the expression of moral conscience that man frees himself from temptations... It is out of this moral conscience that the interests corrupting of his dignity are overcome, the fears that render the heart base and inept are vanquished, the sentiments that generate the worthy, the honest, nay, the strong, are generated. It is this conscience the great characters of the human drama, the innocent, the heroes, the saints, draw their strength from....”**

**That is not the way a cleric is expected to speak, as the **Grace of Christ Redeemer is ignored**, without which we can do nothing. Here, the Sacraments are ignored. Here, prayer is ignored.**

But Paul VI, even in **his Message to the UN** of 4 October 1970, would reiterate:

**“What does this conscience, then, express with so much strength? Human Rights! The conscience of humanity grows stronger and stronger. Men rediscover this inalienable part of themselves which binds them together: the human in man.”**

And on he goes:

**“The ‘Charter of Human Rights’: is to claim for anyone, regardless of race, age, sex, and religion, respect for human dignity and for the conditions necessary to its practice, not to translate, high and clear, the unanimous aspiration of the hearts and the universal testimony of the consciences?”**

As one can see, this new **Humanist Decalogue** contains, to be sure, some fine words that stir the hearts: truths, justice, dignity, solidarity,

equality, brotherhood, etc., but none of them sufficient to subdue the flesh, the world, the devil.

Paul VI, on the contrary, resumes his **Humanist Decalogue** even in his **Brief to the United Nations** of 4 October 1965:

**“A system apt to catering to public welfare such as might interest mankind as a whole, cannot subsist other than yours, founded upon respect of the rights, just freedom, and dignity of the person, with the removal of the fatal folly of war and of the harmful fury of overbearing power.”**

Words to the wind, these of Paul VI, which shall never yield the smallest act of virtue, or a renunciation, or a sacrifice, or an evangelical forgiveness, or any other Christian good.

I would have one read, therefore, what St. Pius X wrote:

**“...According to them, man will be a man truly worthy of the name only when he has acquired a strong, enlightened, and independent consciousness, able to do without a master, obeying only himself, and able to assume the most demanding responsibilities without faltering. Such are the big words by which human pride is exalted.”<sup>237</sup>**

But neither Christ, nor the Grace of the Sacraments, nor the Law of the Gospel dwell in Paul VI's mind, committed, as he is by now, on the naturalist level. In fact, at Bombay, on December 3, 1964, he would stress once again that:

**“The human race is undergoing profound changes and is groping for the guiding principles and the new forces that will lead it into the world of the future.”**

But what kind of **Vicar of Christ** has this Paul VI been?

**“We must – said he – close ranks with one another not only through press and radio and ships and jet-planes, but we must close ranks through our hearts, through our mutual understanding, esteem, and love.”**

Everything onto the human, that is! **Religion**, with him, had no longer a place. It is the **cult of man** that must breed the love of man.

It is freemason-talk all along the line, just as on September 1, 1963, as reported above; words that suit perfectly that association with the ideas of the Masonic French Revolution. **But that’s not how things stand! The principles of 1789 are not at all the principles of the Gospel!** Only by respecting the **Rights of God** shall man have respect for the **Rights of man**, too, for only by making of **Charity, Christian renunciation, and self-oblivion** one’s own life, can man put into practice the Law of Christ: **BUT SEEK YE FIRST THE KINGDOM OF GOD, AND HIS JUSTICE; AND ALL THESE THINGS SHALL BE ADDED UNTO YOU.**<sup>238</sup>

No progress, not even of a human and temporal nature, is at all possible, but insofar as man seeks first the **Kingdom of God**.

All of Paul VI’s words, were but a **chimera** of a **New World**, of a **Paradise on earth**, possible through the exclusive forces of man.

On July 19, 1971, in fact, he said:

**“Something great and new is in the works and it is coming about, which might change the face of the earth.”**

These are words of a vaporous and extravagant Messianism, which

had caused him to utter, at the UN, those other ludicrous and fanciful remarks:

**“Citizens of the world, as you salute the dawn of this new year 1970, take a moment to think: whither is mankind's path leading? Today we can take an overall view, a prophetic view. Mankind is traveling forward, that is, progressing toward an ever greater mastery of the world... And how does this mastery help mankind? It helps it to live a better and fuller life. Mankind seeks fullness of life and obtains it... It strives for that unity, justice, balance and perfection, which we call Peace...**

**“Peace is the logical aim of the present world; it is the destiny of progress; it is the ultimate order the great strivings of civilization are headed for... We proclaim Peace as the dominant idea in the conscious life of man, who wants to see the prospect of his immediate and more distant journey. Once more We proclaim Peace, for Peace is, at one and the same time, under different aspects, both the beginning and the end of the development of society.”<sup>239</sup>**

The ludicrous and hallucinating utterances of a false prophet! The Word of God, besides, clearly refutes **his** assertions. **“Non est pax impiis.”**<sup>240</sup> (The wicked have no peace.) Only Christ can give **peace**, but not in the same manner as worldly peace.

It is appropriate to report once more what **St. Pius X** wrote in his **Letter on the Sillon**:

**“No, Venerable Brethren... The city of the world shall not be built otherwise than as God has built it; society shall not be set up unless the Church lays the foundations and supervises the work;**



**no, civilization is not something yet to be found, nor is the New City to be built on hazy notions; it has been in existence and still is: it is Christian civilization, it is the Catholic City. It has only to be set up and restored continually against the unremitting attacks of insane dreamers, rebels and miscreants. *OMNIA INSTAURARE IN CHRISTO.*”<sup>241</sup>**

**Peace**, therefore, can be a fruit neither of man’s civilization, nor of the United Nations.

And the same must be said of **Justice**. And yet Paul VI, even here, to the conciliar Fathers, on October 4, 1965, said this:

**“We all, convinced that peace has to be founded upon justice, shall become the advocates of justice. Christ wants us to be hungry and thirsty.”**

In reality, however, Jesus spoke of another **justice**, that of man toward God, **Sanctity**, that is, whereas social justice can be but a consequence of the other.

But Paul VI’s mind is that of a revolutionary Messianism: to subordinate the prospective of peace to the establishment of justice. And that he wrote in his **“*Populorum Progressio*”** of 26 March 1967, in which **his analysis** has a flavor of Marxism, since the word **Justice** pairs up with the word **Equality**; that is, either rich peoples share their resources with the deprived peoples, or it would be war (as if it were not exactly the opposite, since it is always the rich and powerful peoples who cause wars, with the precise intent of pushing the poor peoples deeper and deeper into poverty, hence, into impotence).

In any case, all **“*Populorum Progressio*”** did, in the way it is

written, is stir the resentments of Third World peoples, proposing them **development** as an objective (if through their own efforts), and as an **end** the pressure upon the rich peoples, so that they would share their goods. **Development**, that is, is tantamount to **Peace**. Precisely the program, in fact, of Communism.

And that is why **Paul VI, at Bogotà, at Manila, in Australia**, stirred the poor against the rich, indigenous peoples against Westerners; a dialectical masquerade of **class struggle**, softened with the recommendation of an evangelical solution, which repudiates violence and calls for love:

**“That at different times, the Church and the Popes themselves, in other very different circumstances, resorted to arms and temporal power, even for good causes and with the best of intentions. We are not here to judge, now; to Us it is no longer the time to turn to the sword and to force, even when these were to be sustained by aims of justice and progress; and We are confident that all the good Catholics and all the sound and modern public opinion share our view. We are convinced, rather, that the time is ripe for Christian love among men; love must operate, love must change the face of the earth; love must bring justice, progress, brotherhood and peace into the world.”**

A way of speaking, that too, which is **pure Utopia**, perhaps the most unrealizable **in a world without God, in a civilization of sin**. Hence **Paul VI’s** reckoning is, indirectly, an authentic justification of violence; an unveiled authorization **to revolutionary insurrection**, which would be

**“The case of longstanding tyranny which would cause great damage to fundamental human rights and harm to the common**

**good of the country...**"<sup>242</sup>

In conclusion, **Paul VI's program** was:

**"To reduce iniquities, eliminate discrimination, free men from the bonds of servitude, and thus give them the capacity, in the sphere of temporal realities, to improve their lot, to further their moral growth and to develop their spiritual endowments."**<sup>243</sup>

It is a program, however, of **Masonic philanthropy**, of **integral Socialism**, to be realized through force. **St. Pius X** would say, as he did in the Sillon: **"Its eyes fixed on a chimera, brings Socialism in its train."**<sup>244</sup>

Now, that is not the **design of God**, but a causing of the faithful to look away from Heaven in order to turn them into **slaves of the World**, as read in the Apocalypse.

Paul VI's **"Populorum Progressio,"** therefore, save for the idyllic calls to love, in order to reach it, calls for the fusion of religions, the heaping up of them into a chaotic confusion.

What place would religion occupy in that planned **city of man**? What place would be due to religion in that **new humanism** proclaiming continuously that man is sufficient to himself, hence he can do without transcendence, revelation, supernatural redemption, dogma, cult, particular Church? But was it not, on the contrary, exactly this that all of the Popes prior to Paul VI condemned? He, on the contrary, at Sidney, on December 13, 1970, will say:

**"Isolation is no longer an option. The hour has come for the great fellowship of men with each other, and for the setting up of a United and fraternal World community"** and **"The work of peace**

**is not limited to one religious faith; it is the work and duty of every man, regardless of his religious convictions. Men are brothers, God is their Father and their Father wants them to live in peace the ones with the others.”<sup>245</sup>**

But then it is God calling for tolerance, indifference, liberalism, and respect of every religion! If that is the case, God would also want His own discredit, willing that **“a human community be built where men can live truly human lives, free from discrimination on account of race, religion or nationality...”<sup>246</sup>**, hence **“any discrimination, be it of an ethical, cultural, religious or political nature, is unjustified and inadmissible.”<sup>247</sup>**

But that would lead to the conclusion that if religion serves no purpose in this new world society, then neither would God.

And that is the Masonic thought, as well as Maritain’s: **“Integral Humanism can but find its ideological foundations in a profane tradition of the Gospel...”**

But **Paul VI**, too, in his address of January 30, 1965, would say:

**“The Church cannot turn a blind eye onto the ideological, moral and spiritual animation of public life... Work with faith, yes, with confidence toward the Systems that form the norm and history of our society, and which today are the democratic ones.”**

And in his address of September 14, 1965:

**“We feel responsible. We are indebted with everyone. The Church, in this world, is not an aim in itself; she is at the service of mankind; She must make Christ present to all, individuals and peoples.”**

But what **presence of Christ?** That of the lackey?

**“To serve mankind, of every condition, in every weakness and need. The Church has, so to say, proclaimed herself the servant of humanity.”**<sup>248</sup>

And adds he:

**“While other currents of thought and action propose, to build the city of man, different principles such as power, wealth, science, struggle, interest, etcetera, the Church, the Church alone, proclaims love.”**<sup>249</sup>

Paul VI, therefore, that **new city**, ideal and secular, he wanted to fortify with that **supplement of faith and love** the UN needs. But that means that, by osmosis, they will change into one, in man and in love for the world. And that in order to ensure the success of the project of the man who makes himself God. Hence **The religion of the God who became man** should thus place itself at the service of the **the religion of man who makes himself God!**

\*\*\*

How could this Pope, who even at Bethlehem, on January 16, 1964, had said, **“We must ensure to the life of the Church a new way of feeling, of willing, of behaving,”** go on to speak and act as he pleased?

And who on August 12, had said:

**“Religion must be renovated. That is the persuasion of all those**

**who, today, are still (sic) dealing with religion, whether they be outside of its concrete expression: a faith, an observance, a community, or be within a religious profession or discussion. It all depends on what one intends for renovation.”**

It is a speech that might have hinted to a lost faith even on his part, his belonging amongst **those who are still dealing with religion** notwithstanding, so that all religions could fraternize in the temporal action, brushing aside dogmatic conflicts, since **religious struggles are forever gone,**<sup>250</sup> since it is no longer the case to interest the souls in **supreme things,**<sup>251</sup> but to put them at the service of humanity.

**And that is Paul VI’s Ecumenism!** A confusing, that is, all religions into converging expressions of the same **spiritual and moral values** offered to the **men of goodwill** on Earth.

And all that Masonic ecumenism, unfortunately, was the canvas of **his journey to the East, where he even made of Buddhism a religion.** But it was the **purpose** of his journey, that arousing

**“Fruits of a closer understanding between communities of every origin and every religious confession in this part of the world; We do hope, moreover, that (our journey) would foster a concurrent action toward progress, justice, and peace.”**<sup>252</sup>

And at Ceylon, on December 4, 1970:

**“Regardless of caste, FAITH, color and language.”**

Coexistence and collaboration, that is, between all religions. Paul VI would repeat it in **his Address** at the Angelus of 9 August 1970:

**“The conflict engages three ethnic-religious expressions, which**

recognize one sole true God: the Hebrew people, the Islamic people, and, with these and spread worldwide, the Christian people, that is, monotheism, identical monotheism, in its three most authentic, most ancient, most historical, most convinced voices. Would it not be possible that from the name of the very same God, instead of irreducible oppositions, sprang forth a sentiment of mutual respect, of possible agreement, of peaceful cohabitation? Could not the reference to the same God, to the same Father, without the prejudice of theological dispute, one day lead to the discovery, so difficult and indispensable, that we are all brothers? (...). Dreadful and at one time disheartening are the boldness and lightness of spirit of men who declare themselves Catholics, who dream of establishing on the earth, outside of the Catholic Church, ‘the kingdom of justice and love,’ with workers from everywhere, of every religion and without religion, with or without faith, so long as they forget what divides them; their religious and philosophical convictions, and so long as they share what unites them: a generous idealism and moral forces, gathered ‘wherever is possible.’”

Bewildering indeed! The result of that promiscuity in work, the beneficiary of that cosmopolitan social action, can be but a **democracy** which would be neither Catholic, nor Protestant, nor Jewish: a religion more universal than the Catholic Church, including all men, become, at last, brothers and comrades in the “**Kingdom of God**” (in the “**kingdom of justice and love**”?).

Paul VI, here, gave the **halt** to working for the true **Kingdom of God**, in order to work, instead, for humanity.

And that was also **his** appeal to the **Red Guards of the [Chinese] Cultural Revolution**, as was **his** letter to Cardinal Roy:

**“The Church invites every Christian to a double task of animation and renovation in order to evolve her structures and adapt them to the requirements of our times... The Spirit of the Lord, animating man renewed in Christ, shakes the horizons in which his [man’s] intelligence is keen on finding his self-assurance and the limits in which his action would be circumscribed; he is seized by a force that pushes him to fly past every system and every ideology.”<sup>253</sup>**

It seems the condemnation of Religion in favor of a chimerical Constitution of a **New World**, in which **dogmas** become obstacles to universal understanding and hurdles to brotherhood; in which the **Sacraments** no longer serve any purpose, as men are all equal even without drawing from them, in which even the **Commandments of God** are rejected as unbearable constraints.

In conclusion, with that **Project-Utopia of Paul VI**, the Institution of the Church would crumble to the ground, for the reason that, separated from her way of thinking, educating, and living, she would prevent the Christians from integrating into the world, into the secular community. The integral Humanism advocated by Paul VI would come definitively to suffocate Religion, and turn into **atheist Humanism**. And while Pius X was canonized for the purity of **his** doctrine and for his fortitude in defending the Catholic Faith, today they would be willing to bring to the altar a Paul VI who, with **his Political Utopia**, already expressly condemned by his Predecessors, **attempted to corrupt the Faith of the Church of Christ.** □



## CHAPTER VI

### HIS TOLERANCE AND COMPLICITY □

No one can deny, today, that the famous **revision** of Vatican II had been an authentic **betrayal**. It is no use attempting to explain and justify this state of things. After trying, for many years, to pretend that all was going well, that all the Church was suffering from was a healthy **crisis of growth**, but that, in the end, all would turn out into a wonderful flourishing, now, that thesis having become unsustainable, they would have one believe that all of the current **evil** can be

attributed neither to the Pope nor to Vatican II, but only to the disobedience of the faithful in failing to adapt to what the Council would have wanted.

Certainly, one cannot lay all the blame for such a disaster upon **Paul VI** alone, even though he himself spoke of **self-destruction** afoot in the Church; **in any case, he surely deserves the lion's share in the current decline of the Church.**

Therefore, to accuse of disobedience to the Pope and to the Council, after this visible subverting of doctrine, morals, and ecclesiology, with the unhealthy **revisions** that led to an evident destruction of the traditional values of the Church of Tradition, would be a sign of intellectual shortsightedness or dishonesty. The **facts** and the **texts** are still there for all to see, and they are the product of the Hierarchy of the Church. Undeniably! Wiping out, with the Holy Office, its restrictions, which raised dams in protection from the waves of error and evil, in protection of souls, meant granting permission to the invasion and submersion of the Church into the tidal waves of error and immorality.

Now, how could Paul VI call for or accept decisions so lacking even in common sense? Regrettably, to his own eyes, **human dignity** required that all that might resemble offense to man's **freedom** be suppressed, as if today's man no longer carried **original sin** and, therefore, no longer carried any inclination to sin, as if man were endowed with a perfect judgment and a universal knowledge of all.

How Paul VI, who let every heresy go free without ever intervening against the theoreticians or the propagators, could refer to Catholic Faith is impossible to comprehend. Sure, Paul VI undersigned the encyclicals "*Mysterium Fidei*" (3 September 1965), "*Sacerdotalis*

*Coelibatus*” (24 June 1967), “*Humanae Vitae*” (25 July 1968), which are a faithful[?] echo of Catholic Tradition; as he also had to suffer for the systematic criticism that came about, for some of his Acts of Magisterium, on the part of many priests and whole Episcopates. In any case, **his affirming Truth without ever condemning errors remains incomprehensible.**

We can similarly express our wonderment for his traditional doctrine in his Wednesday **Allocutions** (save for some exceptions), while he let a flood of insane theories and dogmatic and moral rubbish be taught even in the churches. It was, therefore, an inexplicable toleration, at any level, of so many errors Paul VI seemed to reject, and yet continuously let flourish about him, though these poisoned souls.

In so acting, his negligence was similar to that which earned pope Honorius the condemnation of anathema. Nay, **Paul VI** went further, he went as far as favoring the advocates of errors and novelties harmful to the doctrine of our Faith. In fact, he even defended them and praised them, and many of them he summoned to high offices, as if he banded together with them in the common cause of a **Conciliar Reform** toward the creation of a **New Church**.

**Negligence, inertia, complicity.** And friends of Atheists and Communists, on account of a yearning for **dialogue** that allowed him to cut peace with Protestants, shirking the **ancient condemnations** and withholding **new condemnations** of the protestantization afoot in the Church.

And thus he started and carried forward the demolition of all protection defending the Church against **errors**. In fact:

On December 7, 1965, he suppressed the Congregation of the Holy Office, and not only changed its name into “Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith,” but also changed, what is most important, its regulations<sup>254</sup>, so that errors could no longer be condemned in the traditional way.

**“Perfect love wipes away fears... The progress of human culture, whose import for religion must not be neglected, requires that the faithful follow more fully and with additional love the directives, if they can well discern the *raison d’être* of the definitions and of the laws...”**

This suggests that the faithful follow the directives of the Church, but only **“if they can well discern the *raison d’être* of the definitions and of the laws,”** or else... they would not be bound to obey when those definitions and laws did not concur with their own judgments - which introduced, even in the Catholic Church, the free thought of Protestantism.

Then, as a logical consequence of that change of the Holy Office, **Paul VI proceeded to suppress the Index**, namely, the catalogue of the books the Holy See prohibited as bad or harmful to the Faith.

**“The main reason that has urged the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith (to cut short the reprinting of the Index) – said cardinal Ottaviani – is that it no longer responds to the needs... In the Declaration On Religious Freedom, in the Decree On the Apostolate of the Laity, and in the Constitution on The Church in the Modern World, the Council has acknowledged to the secular a greater maturity and higher responsibilities in the Church, Mystical Body of Christ.”<sup>255</sup>**

An odd act, to say the least, as it seems that **Paul VI** had had the power to bestow upon the faithful a **spiritual and intellectual maturity** capable of replacing the Magisterium of the Church.

For this reason, cardinal Ottaviani had to explain that

**“In the climate of the Council, the Church will formulate some authorized indications, some alerts, some advises, some warnings, rather than condemnations...”<sup>256</sup>.**

That, however, seemed to say that the diffusion of bad books, of false and erroneous doctrines, would no longer have anything to do with the Magisterium. In that way, however, by abolishing the **Index** and its sanctions, **Paul VI** favored the spreading of error, turning himself into a downright accomplice.

**“The Index no longer carries the force of ecclesiastical law with the censures associated with it. The Church has confidence in the mature conscience of the faithful.” (!!)<sup>257</sup>**

Ingenuousness! Here, instead, is the result of that **ecclesial thoughtlessness**: today, one reads anything, completely unchecked. And the moral decline, the confusion of religious ideas, before so many different religions and theories, is before everyone’s eyes. And then, where is the **vigilance** (other than **the incompetence!**) of many **Ordinaries and of the Episcopal Conferences**, which still have the duty of standing watch?

And how explain that, months after the abolition of the Index, were also abolished two articles of the **Canon Law** dealing with the condemnation of bad books and with the imposition of sanctions upon their authors? In fact, on November 15, 1966, **it was again**

**Paul VI who declared abrogated Canon 1399 on the prohibition of books, and Canon 2318 on ecclesiastical censures, imposed upon the authors and apologists of immoral books and upon the supporters of false doctrines.**

He did this **through a Decree**, which reads:

**“Those who, possibly, were bound by censures, as provided for in Canon 2318, containing punishments against those in violation of the laws on the censures and interdiction of books, are absolved by effect of the abrogation of the said Canon.”<sup>258</sup>**

Hence, even the authors who, in the past, had been condemned by the Holy Office for their scandalous or heretical works, today, **with the New Church of Paul VI, are absolved**, without asking of them **either repentance or retraction of their errors.**

This leads to conclude that, to Paul VI, that which under his Predecessors was considered **error** or **hazard** for the Christian souls, under **his Pontificate** it was no longer such. Therefore, by absolving the heretical or immoral authors and distributors, not converted, of bad books, **Paul VI signed the approval of the error and granted it citizenship rights in the Church.**

Another green light of Paul VI was that of the **abolition of the anti-modernist Oath prescribed by St. Pius X** to the clergy in order to shield them from the doctrinal errors of Modernism. He had also prescribed a **Profession of Faith**, of the **Council of Trent**, already prescribed by **Pius IV**.

**Paul VI** abrogated these two provisions of Pius X, and replaced them with a brief accommodating and flexible formula. That **anti-**

**modernist Oath** must have been, to **Paul VI**, against the **freedom** of the clergy, as it kept it from thinking and believing differently, and that was against Vatican II. In fact, Vatican II had decreed that:

**“Each one, within the Church... will retain the freedom one deems worth... even with respect to the theological elaboration of the revealed truth”<sup>259</sup> (?!).**

Bewildering indeed!

But **Paul VI**, too, had wanted a Vatican II that would be only **pastoral**, hence removed from **solemn pastoral formulas that are called dogmatic<sup>260</sup>**. Doubtless it was not to upset a modern man no longer fond of the role of **pupil**, and not to upset the sensibility of the **separated brethren**. In fact, in the same opening address, Paul VI said:

**“To our Faith, which We hold as divine, we owe the frankest and firmest adhesion. But We are convinced that She is not an obstacle to the desired understanding between our separated Brothers and us, precisely because she is truth of the Lord and she is, therefore, principle of unity and not of divergence or separation. In any case, We do not wish to make of our faith a motive of polemic with them.”<sup>261</sup> (?!)**

How could **Paul VI** say that integral Christian Faith cannot be an obstacle to those who accept it fully, whereas it would be so to those who accept it only in part? Has Our Lord not said, perhaps, **“For from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three. The father shall be divided against the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother; the**

**mother in law against her daughter in law, and the daughter in law against her mother in law?”<sup>262</sup>**

So, **only the Truth of the Lord is principle of unity**, and that only among those who accept it. And yet **Paul VI, not to create “a reason of polemic,” abstained from teaching of authority, as it was indeed his very serious duty.**

But he had already written it in his first Encyclical, **“*Ecclesiam suam*”**:

**“...Nor do We propose to make this encyclical a solemn proclamation of Catholic doctrine or of moral or social principles. Our purpose is merely to send you a sincere message, as between brothers and members of a common family.”<sup>263</sup>**

But what value could an encyclical have, then, which did not contain **specific teachings**? Not a serious affair! However, given the content of that encyclical, one can rejoice today that it did not have a **solemn and peculiarly doctrinal character**, but a merely **colloquial** one.

**“The Church must enter into dialogue with the world in which it lives (!) – it reads - We are fully aware that it is the intention of the Council to consider and investigate this special and important aspect of the Church's life.”<sup>264</sup>**

Words that sound as a farewell to the **command** of Jesus Christ, **“Going therefore, teach ye all nations,”<sup>265</sup>** and to His imperative ***docete***. Paul VI has thus cancelled the ***docete*** and turned it into a **dialogue**, that is, a mere **listening exercise**.

Hardly an act of **courage**, I should say, **that canceling from the**



**Gospel Christ's imperative "*docete*," an act I would rather define as an authentic betrayal of the Faith.**

Incredible, but true! Neither the supreme Hierarchy, nor the scholars of theology have ever stressed that **forced** inversion between *docete* and **discuss**. Neither did I hear a condemnation, with regard to **Paul VI's "Creed,"** of what he had written in **his** introduction, in which he sets out with the following quaint (modernistically clear, though) "fine-tuning":

**"We are about to make a profession of faith, and We are about to repeat the formula that begins with the word "Creed," which, without being a dogmatic definition in the strict sense of the word..."<sup>266</sup>**

Astonishing! But **why?** Perhaps out of respect for individual **freedom of thought?** What was stirring in Paul VI's mind, that urged him to point out that **even the articles of faith, enumerated in the "Creed" are not a dogmatic definition?**

But even with **his appeal** (of October 11, 1962), in "*Mysterium Fidei*," he desired a **new language with new formulas**, in order to render the Catholic Faith more accessible and credible to modern man. A feat he himself was never able to accomplish.

**In any case, with the excuse of a "revision," even doctrinal, he opened the doors to all kinds of heresies, granting the greatest freedom and real immunity to Christians, as well as complete autonomy to scholars and theologians.<sup>267</sup> It was then that he abrogated all the instruments and control institutions for doctrine. **And that marked the end of Authority. Licence, now ruled.****

Paul VI thus, as a side effect, became sympathetic with heretics, having turned accomplice and Protector, even for the reason that he imposed this **new direction in his new Church, with a Magisterium wrongfully proposed as “Ordinary.”**

In June of 1969, he had already announced:

**“We are headed toward a period of greater freedom in the life of the Church, and, consequently, for each of her children. This freedom shall mean less legal obligations and less inner inhibitions. Formal discipline shall be softened, every arbitrariness abolished... Every intolerance and every absolutism shall similarly be abolished.”**<sup>268</sup>

Lamentably, **Paul VI put that anarchical form directly into practice.** Having made it his duty to **become the Pope of the *apertura*, of the universal welcome**, he kept at it, indeed, without delay, but only with the representatives of **error** and **vice**, as, for example, with the Communist chiefs, fierce persecutors, soiled with the blood of Christian Martyrs, offering them the warmest hospitality, even though, the visit over, they would resume the torturing and slaughtering of the faithful children of the Church.

The simpletons had seen, in those gestures of Paul VI, a luminous sign of charity, whereas we dispute this precisely on the very level of that very virtue. We say: why did Paul VI use that opening and tolerance with the distant, while he always made an exception when it came to the **Traditionalists?** Was traditional Faith then such an awful **crime**, to his eyes, that he denied them even a brief **visit**, while **to the representatives of every religion, actresses, sportsmen, revolutionaries...** he granted every possibility of encounter and conference with him?

Let us bring some examples:

On June 29, 1970, several hundred traditionalist Catholics traveled to Rome, from all parts of the world, in a pilgrimage, requesting also an **audience** with the Pope. They waited for hours and hours, in prayer, at St. Peter's square. To no avail! **The audience was not granted**, nay, it was **denied**. In the same week, however, Paul VI received, with open arms, the revolutionary chief of the anti-Portuguese rebellion. Even the press reacted. The *Osservatore Romano* (4 July 1970) tried to explain that Paul VI's gesture should not be regarded as wrong, for **“the Pope, – wrote the Vatican newspaper – as his mission demands, receives all those requesting the comfort of a blessing.”**

As one can see, it was a declaration of hypocrisy, which bordered on ridicule. The Pope received everybody? And the Traditionalists?

Another case: on May 30, 1971, another pilgrimage to Rome of **Traditionalists** from all over the world. Another entreaty to obtain an audience. Another stark refusal. And yet, at that same time, Paul VI received, in **special audience, two soccer teams**, and, to follow, **the American Jewish Masonic Association of the B'nai B'rith**.

Paul VI himself apologized; saying that he received the **former**, as he was much into sports himself, **“soccer, in particular, even when it ends up in a brawl.”** And that he was also interested in the **French-Masonic Association of the B'nai-B'rith**, since it had much toiled, during the Council, to ensure the triumph of the thesis of the Jewish **Jules Isaac**, who, however, had dared to affirm, **“Your Evangelists are downright liars!”** and again, **“Your Fathers of the Church are forgers, are iniquitous.”**<sup>269</sup>

**“Facts”** and **remarks** that call for cogitation.

One more example: in June of 1973, while he again refused to receive the representatives of **4000 traditional Catholics**, from all over the world, Paul VI received, in special audience, a group of **Talmudic Rabbis** and the **Patriarch of the Bonzes**.

And so forth and so on. **Freemasons, Communists, enemies of the Church**, were all and always received by Paul VI, with open arms, while he **always kept the Traditionalists, implacably, at the door**.

And while he received Bishops and priests who supported Communism, who gave their blessing to immoral books, or erroneous in Faith, since he was respectful of their **“freedoms,” Paul VI sacrificed cardinal Mindszenty**, martyr of the Communist folly and criminality, **on the altar of his unspeakable *Ostpolitik***, to the point of reducing him to the status of a **“suspended *a divinis!*”**

It is thus clear that **Paul VI had always double standards**. To achieve his **“dream” of a great universal tolerance**, he intended to eliminate all the **intolerant**, that is, all those who were not prepared to compromise with error, nor to adulterate their Faith so as not to upset the enemies of Christ and of His Gospel.

But that was and still is the **ideal** and **plan** of Freemasonry, too: to eliminate all that **divides**, such as **dogmas**, hinge of a **sole truth**, the holy intransigence that gave the Church millions of Martyrs. For that very same **plan** Paul VI continued to fight, arrogant and blind, in order to achieve his **illusory Utopia of a Universal Humanism**.

And the **evidence** of his Utopia is indeed in all the **facts** that have taken place during his Pontificate: **on the one hand, the friendship**

**with the dissidents, with the heretics, with the mundane, with the rebels, with the atheists, and opening to all religions; on the other, his constant hostility and inflexibility against the defenders of the Catholic Faith.**

**An opening, his opening, characteristic of a Masonic Ecumenism, that calls to mind his true masters: Lamennais, with his Messianism; Sangnier, with his Christian Democracy; Jacques Maritain, with his Integral Humanism.**

That is to say:

- **Humanity**, in lieu of the Church and Christianity;
- The **Charter of Man's Rights as New Gospel**, with its trilogy: **Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity.**
- **World Democracy**, or earthly version of the **Kingdom of God**, and a **"Religion" inclusive of every confession**, and as inspirer of a renewed Humanity.

Hence: **Humanity in lieu of the Church!**

**Pope Leo XIII, on the contrary, in his encyclical "*Humanum Genus*" (20 April 1884) had written:**

**"The race of man (...) is separated into two diverse and opposite parts, of which the one steadfastly contends for truth and virtue, the other of those things which are contrary to virtue and to truth. The one is (...) the true Church of Jesus Christ (...) The other is the kingdom of Satan."**

But Paul VI had ignored that ever since his **"*Ecclesiam suam*,"** in

which in practice he rejected the dominion of the Church upon the temporal society (Christianity), to recognize only a **profane World** as a universal social body, autonomous, external to the Church.

It is for this reason that, in his encyclical, Paul VI omitted the two **passages** of St. Paul to the Corinthians:

**“And what concord hath Christ with Belial?... And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?”<sup>270</sup>**

**Paul VI**, at Bombay, on December 3, 1964, said:

**“Man must meet man, nation meet nation, as brothers and sisters, as children of God. In this mutual understanding and friendship, in this sacred communion (sic), we must also begin to work together to build the common future of the human race... Such a union cannot be built on a universal terror or fear of mutual destruction; it must be built on the common love that embraces all and has its roots in God, who is love.”**

It was his **“new Humanistic Creed.”** He would reiterate it in his **Address to the FAO**, on November 6, 1970:

**“Man turns to man as he recognizes him as his own brother, as the son of the same Father.”**

And since all men, down deep, are good, **he, Paul VI**, **“expert in humanism”<sup>271</sup>**, again said:

**“Yes, peace is possible, for men, down deep, are good, they lean toward reason, toward order and common good; peace is possible for in the heart of the new men, of the young, of those who understand the march of civilization...”<sup>272</sup>**

**“Democracy, which human communal living today appeals to, must open up to a universal idea that transcends the limits and the hurdles to an effective brotherhood.”<sup>273</sup>**

And in one of his addresses, on January 1, 1970, he would repeat:

**“You, the people, have the right to be heard. But you have the sacred and legitimate right to demand of your leaders that they run the body politic in a manner that would cause you no sufferings... Well, then, we are the democracy (!!)... This means that people are in charge, that power comes of the number (?!), from the people, such as it is. If we are conscious of such a social progress that is spreading everywhere, we must give democracy this voice, this password: the people does not want the war. The masses must impose the principle that there must be no more wars in the world.”**

**Thus God must no longer punish the “sins.”**

Thus even if the word of God is **“Non est pax impiis”<sup>274</sup>**, it must **no longer carry any significance.**

Thus the supernatural virtues, the Grace of the Sacraments, the obedience to God’s Commandments no longer carry weight in society, over this fancied **Universal Democracy** which ignores not only **original sin**, but commits countless sins at all times, **continuously arousing the “punishments of God.”**

And yet **Paul VI**, though **“Vicar of Christ,”** has substituted the UN – that Masonic Babel Tower – as supreme hope for humanity.

That, he had recognized, already, and uttered, on October 4, 1969, at Manhattan, at the very **heart** of the UN:

**“The peoples of the earth turn to the United Nations as the last hope of concord and peace. We presume to present here, together with Our own, their tribute to honor and of hope. You exist and operate to unite the Nations, to connect the States; let us use this second formula: to put together the ones with the others. You are an Association. You are a bridge between peoples... We would be tempted to say that your chief characteristic is a reflection, as it were, in the temporal field of what Our Catholic Church aspires to be in the spiritual field: unique and universal. Among the ideals by which mankind is guided, one can conceive of nothing greater on the natural level... In this way a system of solidarity is established, so that lofty civilized aims may win the orderly and unanimous support of all the family of peoples for the common good and for the good of each individual.**

**This is the finest aspect of the United Nations; it is its most truly human aspect; it is the ideal that mankind dreams of on its pilgrimage through time; it is the world's greatest hope; it is, We presume to say, the reflection of the loving and transcendent design of God for the progress of the human family on earth, a reflection in which We see the heavenly message of the Gospel.”**

It was a senseless talk that buried all of his dignity of **“Vicar of Christ.”** How could anyone dare praise that Masonic organization, whose aim is to attain the enslavement of the peoples, the annulment of national autonomies, the dissolution of national sovereignties? An organization pursuing dominance over the world and over the consciences, pursuing but a political dictatorship, an economic dictatorship, an ideological, ethical and moral dictatorship?

**Paul VI**, on the contrary, saw it as the ultimate realization of the **“design of God”** on earth, as the ultimate hope for humanity.



But was it not impiety his saying that the UN is the political image of the Church, the earthly reflection of the Gospel, the real and universal expression of the design of God?

□

## CHAPTER VII

### HIS OPENING TO COMMUNISM □

In the book of the German Reinhard Raffalt: **“Where is the Vatican Headed?”** with subtitle: **“The Pope Between Religion and Politics,”** the author offers a soft and yet precise judgment as to **Paul VI’s** action in this field. The chapter dedicated to the Vatican Ostpolitik is meaningfully titled: **“Hamlet on the Holy See.”** While placing the accent upon the **“mens” of Pius XII** on Communism, which Pius XII defines **“a tragedy for humanity,”** hence he drew the consequences through the **“excommunication”** of all Catholics professing their communist faith, through his constant refusal of any contact with Communism, because **“intrinsically aberrant,”** the chapter goes on to show the path followed by the Church under Pius XII’s former collaborator, monsignor Montini, the future Paul VI.

To Paul VI, that is, Communism represented a hope, for it realized

(?!) a social justice higher than that realized by Capitalism. Did not the Gospel, perhaps, preach a justice on this earth, too? And so, would it not be possible to persuade the communists to adopt the Christian ideal of communal life?

**Paul VI**, therefore, **countered Pius XII's line with his pragmatic line**: Communism, albeit atheist, does not imply, for that reason, a basic inability to meet the social expectations contained in the Gospel. Hence Monsignor Montini's "**contrasting**" attitude toward **Pius XII**, convinced as he was of the necessity of contributing, *in primis*, to the improvement of the material living conditions of the entire humanity. Hence his "**secret relations**" with the Communist Party (PC), ever since he collaborated, or, better, **betrayed** Pius XII. By now, **Montini's betrayal belongs to History**. A true and authentic history! It was 1954, and illness and old age were already exacting their toll on Pius XII. It was colonel **Arnauld**, of the **French Deuxième Bureau**, the Brigadier General for the **Intelligence Service**, and Pius XII's "**James Bond**." A career officer, then, but, above all, a man of strict morals and a practicing Catholic. At the end of the war, he leaves the British and resumes his post within the ranks of the French **Secret Services**. It is then, shortly after the armistice, that the "**Quai d'Orsay**" (French Foreign Ministry) entrusts him with a mission by Pope Pius XII, to ask him to expel from their dioceses twenty-two French bishops, whom Charles De Gaulle's government held responsible for having favored Marshal Pétain's regime. When he presented the request of his government (received by the Pope "**very coldly**"), Pius XII asked to know "**the personal judgment of the ambassador, of the Catholic, of the officer, whose sister is Mother Superior of a Convent in Rome**." The colonel asked for time in order to study the **dossiers** of the twenty-two bishops. When he returned to Rome, he manifested his "judgment" on the case; Pius XII concurred with his judgment and had only two bishops removed

from France, refusing to **punish the others.**

Shortly after, Colonel Arnauld resigned from the Deuxième Bureau. Pius XII, having got wind of it, summoned him to Rome and offered him employment as his personal agent, answering only to Pius, because – said he – **“A diplomat must stick to some rules and be very prudent; unlike an agent.”**

The Colonel takes on the offer, takes his oath to the Pontiff and sets out on his new mission. During a tour in the East, he entered into relationship with the Lutheran bishop of Uppsala, Primate of Sweden, who, holding Pius XII in great esteem, did not hesitate to lend him precious services, such as helping out members of the Clergy, held in detention, and the stealthy introduction of Bibles into Russia, etc. In the course of one of these meetings (toward the summer of 1954), the archbishop of Uppsala suddenly said to the colonel, **“The Swedish authorities are perfectly aware of the Vatican’s relations with the Soviets.”** The Colonel promptly decided to question Pius XII, once he returned from his mission. Back in Italy, in fact, he questioned the Holy Father, who, quite astounded by the thing, asked the Colonel to tell Monsignor Brilioth that the Vatican had no relations with the Soviets.

But when Colonel Arnauld returned to Sweden, the archbishop of Uppsala reiterated to him what he had said before, begging him to get back to him as soon as he completed his new mission. The Colonel accepted and went to see the archbishop. Monsignor Brilioth, then, handed him a sealed envelope, addressed to Pius XII, begging him to place it directly into his hands, ensuring that no one else in the Vatican knew about it. All Monsignor Brilioth told the Colonel, was, **“This envelope contains the EVIDENCE of the relations the Vatican entertains with the Soviets.”**

Once in Rome, the Colonel handed the envelope over to Pius XII, who read it in his presence, all blanched in the face.

In brief: the **last official text**, signed by the pro-Secretary of State, Monsignor Montini, bears the date of **23 September 1954**<sup>275</sup>. **On November 1, 1954, Pius XII removed Monsignor Montini from the Secretariate of State.**

From other information it is learned that, in that tragic fall of 1954, Pius XII **had also discovered** that his pro-Secretary of State “**had kept from him all communications relating to the schism of the Chinese Bishops,**”<sup>276</sup> whose case was growing worse.

That Monsignor Montini had been removed from the Secretariate of State as he had fallen into disgrace with Pius XII (whom he **betrayed**) was also admitted by **Jean Guitton** in his book: “**Paul VI Secret,**” wherein he writes, “**No one ever knew, nor will ever know why Pius XII, having made him archbishop of Milan, had not made him a cardinal, which took away from him the possibility of becoming pope**”<sup>277</sup> ... Further on, he writes, “**he (Paul VI) goes through an experience similar to that Pius XII had inflicted upon him: that of the *diffidentia*, as Pius XII seemed to have lost the confidence he had placed in him.**” Sure, Jean Guitton had no knowledge of the **betrayal of his friend**, that is, of that *Ostpolitik* which, as Colonel Arnauld said, “**Montini had already a policy of his own, which was not that of the reigning Pope. That policy, today, is official, and goes by the name of “Vatican Ostpolitik.”**” And so no reason exists anymore to keep these episodes, these facts now consigned to History, locked up in a drawer.

And it is truly so! That is why we talk about it here, as well as for the reason that **I could personally** verify the **truth** of Pius XII’s

heavy action toward His closest collaborator, through a **personal meeting** with General **G. Leconte, of the French Secret Services.**

I was introduced to him by another agent of the “Secret Services,” officer **Masmay**, whose guest I was, at his home, many times. The General spoke to me, at first, of many things relating to the Church of today, as, for example, **that the father of cardinal Daniéleu was a freemason of the Grand Orient**, and that when he became Minister of National Education, he was to impose the secularization of the schools. To my query if also cardinal Daniéleu was a freemason, he replied with an episode: “That same question – said he – I asked, on the phone, a friend of mine, who, however, hung up on me not to respond.” He then went on to inform me **about many other high Prelates and some Jesuits, freemasons; *in primis*, of freemason cardinal Villot<sup>278</sup>. He told me that Villot’s parents were both freemasons of the “Rose Cross.”** And he told me an episode, recounted to him by the very Officer subject of the “**fact**”: when this [officer] learned that the Bishop of Lion, **Villot**, had to leave the Diocese to go to Rome, he paid him a visit, to wish him farewell and congratulate him on that invitation. But Villot said to him, “*Je suis envoyé à Rome pour devenir Pape.*” **And thus – remarked the General with a smile – rather than summoned, he was ‘sent’ by the freemason chiefs.** The General, then, went on to disclose to me a “**secret**” he had learned from a High Officer of the Saudi Arabian espionage (an advisor to the King). He told me, “**Cardinal Villot will not become Pope, as he would pursue the opening to the left of the Vatican Ostpolitik, which is not at all palatable to the Arab anti-Communist world.**”

After more confidences on persons of the Catholic Hierarchy and other Jesuits, he suddenly asked me this question: “**Do you believe that Paul VI is a freemason, too?.**” And without waiting for my

answer, he handed me a book of Carlo Falconi, “*Vue et Entendu au Concile,*” published before Montini became Pope, and showed me a passage of the book, on page 69, in which it is said that a big “33” of Freemasonry assured that even Montini “*serait inscrit dans un Loge maçonnique.*”

At last, he recounted to me the story of the removal of Monsignor Montini from the Secretariate of State by Pius XII, as he was really working for Russia, unbeknown to the Pope, and, therefore, in betrayal of him. It is a fact that Montini never set a foot in the Vatican anymore while Pius XII lived.

To my last question, “But why, then, did Pius XII send Montini to Milan, such a prestigious cardinalitial see, after Montini had betrayed him?” The General answered, smiling, “**Nay! It wasn’t Pius XII who sent him to Milan. We have here another ‘dossier,’ under the heading ‘Cardinal Pizzardo,’ containing documents that say otherwise.** After all, it would not have escaped you that Pius XII never elevated him to the rank of Cardinal, although Milan was traditionally a cardinalitial see, hence Montini found himself rejected from the Roman Curia and removed, for good, by that very Pope he had exerted not a little influence upon; and he was excluded by the future Conclave as Pius XII was determined to bar him from the Sacred College. Even **his consecration[?] to archbishop, after his nomination, was almost ignored by Pius XII.**”

At that point, the General dialed a telephone number, calling Colonel Arnauld, advising him that I would be paying him a call directly. He rose from his armchair and kindly escorted me to the door, saying: “**Colonel Arnaud is expecting you, the Colonel who brought Pius XII the evidence of Montini’s betrayal.**”

Presently, in fact, I arrived at the Colonel's house. He was in a wheelchair, ill. His wife was with him. He seated me opposite him, and, after exchanging the usual courtesies, he set out to tell me what I previously recounted, confirming, in 22 minutes, that **Montini entertained obscure, covert relations, on his own initiative, with Russia and some other Eastern powers, hence Pius XII "expelled" him from the Secretariate of State.** He then told me that Pius XII was forced to accept that Montini be sent to Milan, but that he did not make him Cardinal, never granted him an audience (throughout the remaining four years of Pius XII's life), and that he often signaled to the Cardinals that he would not have him as his successor.

These are not "**State revelations,**" since everything I heard, with my own ears, on the **Montini "affair,"** is still in the "**French Archives.**"

\*\*\*

Now, to continue, I would say that there was a sort of prehistory in the relationships Paul VI entertained with the Communist Party, ever since he was Monsignor Montini. I quote, in this regard, a **document from Washington's National Archives,** in which proof is provided of the future Pope Paul VI's secret meetings with the Italian Communist Chief, **Palmiro Togliatti,** as far back as July of 1944<sup>279</sup>.

**These were meetings and conversations that always took place unbeknown to Pius XII,** as he was deeply hostile to any contacts with the Marxists.

We provide, here, along with the integral text of the original document, in English, the integral translation of that **document,** very

compromising, of a meeting “**Montini-Togliatti**” which took place on July 10, 1944.

It is subdivided into five paragraphs:

1) On last July 10, at the house of a Christian Democrat minister, the Vatican pro-Secretary of State, Monsignor Giovanni Battista Montini, met with Togliatti, Communist minister without portfolio in the Bonomi Government. Their conversation focused on the grounds that bred the agreement between the Christian Democrat and the Communist parties.

2) Ever since his return to Italy, Togliatti had confidential meetings with eminent personalities of the Christian Democrat Party. These contacts represented the political backdrop of Togliatti’s address of Saturday, July 9, at the “Brancaccio” theater [Rome], and the premise for the warm reception of the address on the part of the Catholic press.

3) Through the leaders of the Christian Democrat Party, Togliatti succeeded in conveying to the Vatican his impression, according to which Stalin’s view as to **religious freedom** is by now accepted by Communism, and the agreement between Russia and the allied Nations is marked by a democratic character. Concurrently, the Holy See reached Togliatti through the same intermediaries and made known its view as to the future agreement with Soviet Russia on the issue of Communism, both in Italy and in other Countries.

4) The discussion between monsignor Montini and Togliatti is the first direct contact between a high Prelate of the Vatican and a communist leader. Having reviewed the situation, **they concurred upon the practical possibility of a contingent alliance between**



**Catholics and Communists in Italy, which could win the three parties, Christian Democrat, Socialist and Communist, an absolute majority,** sufficient to allow them to keep in check any political situation.

5) A **“plan”** has been drafted to build the platform of a possible agreement between the Christian Democrat Party and the Communist and Socialist Parties. In practice, they would be following the fundamental lines along which an understanding may be created between the Holy See and Russia, within the framework of their fresh relations.

**It was the first Historical Compromise.** [Announced in late 1973 by Italian Communist Party secretary Enrico Berlinguer, it was the project of an historic alliance (worked out with the Christian Democrat Aldo Moro, murdered by the Red Brigades) with the Socialist and Christian Democrat parties that would allow the Communist Party access to government in a way that might be acceptable to the United States] But Togliatti pushed his contacts with the Holy See even farther, **through Monsignor Montini, the most outspoken anti-Fascist in the Vatican,** who made no secret of his sympathies toward Socialism.

Another proof of this is that **other very serious “accusation” against Montini, for his betrayal of the Homeland.**

And it remains to be explained why the fact that Monsignor Montini, besides betraying **Pius XII** (hence the Church, then governed by Pius XII), was also a **“traitor of the Homeland,”** is not taken into account. And yet it should come as no surprise that **Monsignor Montini was “enlisted” by the “Secret Services” of the United States as a privileged “informer”** of the Vatican, during the

years of World War II.

I transcribe here what the “**Gazzettino**” of 1<sup>st</sup> June 1996, wrote, under the title: “**Montini was an American Spy**”:

**“...To propose a collaboration with Pius XII’s most influential advisor, Secretary of State ‘*in pectore*’, was, in early 1942, done directly by William Donovan, creator of the OSS (Office of Strategic Services). Montini’s task was that of providing any useful ‘information’ as to the movements of the Germans in Rome, and to gather the ‘voices’ circulating in Benito Mussolini’s circles, as well as in the Crown’s circles. The ‘revelations’ are contained in some ‘documents’, unpublished, discovered in the Washington’s ‘National Archives’ by the editors Ennio Caretto and Bruno Marolo, authors of the book: ‘Made in USA. The American Origins of the Italian Republic’.”**

Another betrayal that certainly does not play into the hands of those pushing for his beatification: a Paul VI who betrayed Pius XII, and a Paul VI who betrayed his Homeland.

\*\*\*

Now, to continue the discussion of the “**secret meetings**” between Togliatti and Montini, we note that a Prelate personal friend of the communist leader’s, namely **Monsignor Giuseppe de Luca**, arranged those contacts.

Pope John XXIII – from whom Montini received his purple – opened even wider to Montini the path of **dialogue** with the Communist world, after his famous encyclical “***Pacem in Terris***” of 10 April 1962, in which Communism, though not directly named, is

however considered in full dialectical evolution, that is, no longer coincident with Karl Marx's doctrine, although retaining its principles.<sup>280</sup>

**Paul VI's Pontificate would thus follow that path, cleared by John XXIII**, who had commenced difficult negotiations with the Patriarchs both of Moscow and of Constantinople, Athenagoras. The aim was to ensure some **"Observers"** at the Council, planned for the fall of 1962. For that reason, J. Willebrands was sent to Moscow to negotiate with archbishop Nikodim. **Along that Giovannean line, then, proceeded Paul VI's entire pontificate, always meeting the wishes of the Kremlin**, anxious to secure "the possibility of inducing the Church of Rome to facilitate, through ecumenism, the acceptance of the communist reality by Catholic public opinion in the satellite Countries, and, in general, to **guide the Vatican onto diplomatic positions convergent with those of the USSR in the field of disarmament and maintenance of a "Pax Sovietica."**

**Paul VI made a show of his spirit of reconciliation with the Communist world**, for example, **on the occasion of the Episcopal Synod of Rome**, in the Fall of 1971. The theme was: **Justice and Peace**. The Vatican had given instructions to impress on the Synod a strong anti-capitalist spin, in dealing with the injustices caused to the undeveloped Countries by the most technologically advanced nations. But archbishop **Maxim Hermanioux**, Metropolitan of the Ukrainians, attending the works, had the courage to react, saying:

**"I find it highly surprising that, in the project and in the base account, one would deal with all possible forms of injustice: political, cultural, economical and international, but not with the most deplorable to a Christian: the persecution of the Church of Christ"!**..

Archbishop Hermanioux was speaking for the faithful of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, remaining in Russia, persecuted by the communists; and certainly, he was alluding to the events of the previous years. In 1970, in fact, the Patriarch of Moscow, Pimen, had announced, during his investiture, that the **Ukrainian Catholic Church “was no more.”** And cardinal Willebrands, Pontifical negotiator since 1962, official envoy of Paul VI at the ceremony, had failed to react, either on the spot, or after his return to Rome. **Paul VI, in this way, gave victory to atheist Moscow, persecutor of the Catholic faithful.**

But in Rome was **already cardinal Joseph Slipyi** (following 17 years of incarceration in Soviet concentration camps, and narrowly escaping execution), directing a large community of Ukrainian faithful emigrated to Canada, to the United States and above all to Australia. **The Hierarchy of his Church**, in June of 1971, **approached Paul VI**, on behalf of the entire community, **requesting the appointment to Patriarch of the great archbishop** (a dignity whose functions, in reality, Slipyi was already carrying out); but **Paul VI**, on July 7, **rejected the request**, which He considered **“impossible, at least at this point and time.”**

**Slipyi**, then, convened a **particular “Ukrainian Synod”** (as was his prerogative). **Paul VI, in vexation, had it promptly declared illegal.** But the Ukrainians went on with it, and that action carried not a little consequence upon the works of the Council.

**Paul VI, however, never forgot it, and one year later he took his revenge. The freemason cardinal Villot, his Secretary of State, addressed a statement to the Ukrainian bishops informing them that: “The Ukrainian Church has no longer authority upon its Bishops outside of the Holy See.” With that action, Paul VI stripped**

**cardinal Slipyi of any authority and his Church lost all its autonomy.** And so the Soviets had been satisfied. And in that way, perhaps, Paul VI thought – his umpteenth illusion? – to foster relations between the Vatican and the Kremlin.

In any case, that was the style of **his pragmatism**, which he always practiced in his relationships with Moscow. As in regard to the appointments of the Bishops in Lithuania, **approving the Soviet choices**, despite their perverted continuous political control. And when, in May of 1972, an Ukrainian student set himself ablaze, publicly, in protest against Moscow's oppression toward the Church, the **utter "silence" of the Vatican** was more than eloquent, to anyone.

**But Paul VI would always swallow anything.** Even when Moscow used a contemptuous demeanor with archbishop **Casaroli**, on the occasion of the signature of the Treaty of Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Arms, at Moscow, Paul VI abstained from any reaction.

Silence, always silence! Even despite the **continuous persecutions against the Catholic faithful**, who were being **thrown into gulags, tortured, shipped to Siberia, and murdered**. The most marked and evident gestures, in favor of the wishes of the Soviets, on the part of Paul VI, one could hardly add up. Even **his cardinals he removed from their sees**, thus depriving them of any influence, precisely on account of their intransigence toward the local Governments. So did he with **Cardinal Mindszenty**, whom **Paul VI**, on 18 December 1974, **"relieved" from his office of "Primate."**

In vain Cardinal Mindszenty put up a resistance, in name of the **"damage to religious life and the confusion such a measure would cause in the souls of the Catholics and clerics faithful to the**

**Church.” Lamentably, Paul VI would have the upper hand with his *Ostpolitik*, always worshipping the criminal “reason of State.”**

And so, on January 5, 1974, the Holy See publicized **Paul VI’s decision, breaking the “news” of the removal of cardinal Mindszenty from the Primatial Episcopal See of Esztergom.**

Will note Mindszenty, in his **Memoirs: “I begged him (Paul VI) to recede from that decision, but to no avail.”**

Unfortunately, on June 8, 1977, **Paul VI demeaned himself to receive Janos Kadar, too.** No Communist Party Secretary had ever crossed the threshold of a Pope’s private study. There would come about, sadly, even the first approach, outside the norm, between John XXIII and Adzhubei. **Kadar would be the second. He, the murderer *in pectore*, as he was the instigator, of cardinal Mindszenty, the great “Confessor” of the “Church of the Silence.”** That gesture of Paul VI, however, constituted a shame for **his inhuman and scatterbrained *Ostpolitik*, which left hundreds and hundreds of thousands of Catholics in the gulags and under the tortures, without a minimal solemn protest, public, before the world,** in order to remain faithful to his pro-Soviet political line that would end disastrously, in a heap of rubble, stained in the blood of its **“Martyrs.”**

Among these, stands out the great cardinal Mindszenty, **humiliated by Paul VI before the whole world, with his “deposition” from “Primate of Hungary.”** He who had never accepted the about-turn of a Church on her knees before the world. **He, the symbol and banner of an intrepid and irreducible Catholicism, who had never stooped before the persecutors of the “Church of Silence,” or to the “priests of the peace,”** the new unworthy preachers of a Gospel in a

sociological and Marxist key.

And yet, this **Great Confessor of the Faith**, laid to rest on May 15, 1975, in the Hungarian Chapel of St. Ladislao, at Mariazell (Austria), instead of an apotheosis – as he deserved – saw **not even a “Representative”** of the **“new” Hungarian Catholic Church**, which sent neither a wreath nor a word. Not even the Apostolic Nuncio to Austria attended. Only the **“free world”** – 4000 Hungarians exiled throughout the world, 250 priests and about a hundred nuns – had convened before the tomb of that **Apostle-Martyr** of our times.

\*\*\*

But by now, on the wave of the Vatican II, the Holy See had taken the path of the **“dialogue”** even with the Communist criminal power, through compromises and collaboration. And thus any anti-Communist position was regarded as outdated and unrealistic; and, because of the **utopia** of a possible **“normalization”** of the ecclesiastical position with the Soviet States, the Church of Paul VI left our Martyrs of the Faith to their fate in exchange for an illusory freedom-on-parole.<sup>281</sup>

Hence in that new climate of submission and treachery, the position of cardinal Mindszenty had become embarrassing for their dull **“dialogue”** between Rome and Budapest. And for that reason monsignor Casaroli had called on the cardinal, proposing him a dishonorable proffer of **“freedom”** in exchange for his renunciation of his intransigence toward Communism. But the dignified figure of Mindszenty disdained that disgraceful **“blackmail,”** and rejoined that a **“Reigning-Cardinal”** could not abandon his flock. **But Paul VI**, in 1971, **also urged by the freemason cardinal König**, sent in

**Monsignor Aàgon to bend the Cardinal**, guaranteeing him freedom in the West, and the **preservation of the title of “Primate of Hungary,”** as well as the care of the Hungarian communities, exiled and emigrated. With that, however, Paul VI wanted **him to hand over his office** to a successor acceptable to the Budapest regime, **leave Hungary without any statements**, and, once in the West, **abstain from any action that “could upset the relations between the Apostolic See and the Hungarian Government, or could cause any harm to the Government of the People’s republic of Hungary.”** As a last requirement, **cardinal Mindszenty would not publish his Memoirs, rather, he was to make them over to the Vatican, which would then proceed as it saw fit.”**<sup>282</sup>

**Cardinal Mindszenty**, a worthy man in spite of it all, **declined the offer**, both because he did not intend to submit his actions and statements to the judgment of a criminal Marxist Government, and because his renunciation under those **kinds of Soviet “censures”** would have been an act of infamy, and because his silence and his omissions would have been received as a scandal by his faithful, and read as a caving in to the Kadar dictatorship. And so he even refused to sign the record of that interview. But **the other freemason-cardinal, Casaroli**, determined to bend his resolve, turned to US president Nixon so that the cardinal would be forced out of the American Embassy. And that is what happened. **Mindszenty, having lost diplomatic asylum, was compelled to give up**, and on September 28, 1971, he arrived in Rome. **Paul VI feigned to renew his role and his freedom; instead, barely two weeks later, the Holy See announced the resumption of diplomatic relations with Budapest. Besides, Paul VI disgracefully lifted the excommunication Pius XII had inflicted against the clerics collaborationist with the Kadar regime; and months later, He also reneged on the promise of leaving Mindszenty the spiritual**



**care of the Hungarians exiles in the West. But he did not stop there, as he added the humiliation of forcing him to submit any sermon or speech he was to utter in public to the preliminary Vatican censure.**<sup>283</sup>

At this point, the Cardinal left Rome, and made contacts with his emigrant and exiled people. **But Paul VI promptly resumed his attacks on the cardinal** – whose shoes he was unworthy to kiss – and **on November 1, 1973, he forced him to resign from his position of Archbishop-Primate of Hungary.** Dignifiedly, yet firmly, cardinal Mindszenty, on December the 8th, replied to Paul VI that he could not give in spontaneously to his intimidation; and he illustrated to him the heavy consequences his collaborationist policy with the Marxist Regime would bring about.<sup>284</sup> **But Paul VI** (who had betrayed Pius XII already, precisely for his covert maneuvers with Moscow), **on December 18 informed him, cynically, that Hungary's Primatial See had been declared vacant already, and, therefore, he must consider himself dismissed.** Mindszenty took note of Paul VI's unspeakable action, bequeathing to him any responsibilities for the consequences, but informed the press that the **“measure” against him had been taken unilaterally, against his own will.** After which, he felt free to publish **his Memoirs**, in which he narrates – in the closing chapter – **also the persecutions he suffered on the part of the Vatican diplomacy and on the part of the apologists of the *Ostpolitik!***

**And now, let us again ask ourselves: is that the Paul VI one would be willing to beatify?** Is it perhaps on account of those **excesses of “charity”** he had toward that capital defender of the Catholic Faith, diabolically encroached on by the Satanic Marxist empire? Lamentably, **Paul VI would continue to ill-treat that Martyr of the “Church of Silence,”** placing on the Hungarian

Primate of the Holy See, in early 1976, as his successor, that darling of the freemason cardinal König, Laszlo Lekai, former spokesman of the Kadar Government by the Holy See, and defender of the ill-famed **“priests of the peace,”** lackeys of the Marxist regime. In addition, Paul VI, in 1977, would welcome Kadar at the Vatican, in full pomp, Mindszenty’s Satanic persecutor, to whom Paul VI reaffirmed his confidence (!! ) in the **“dialogue on the issues, open to the comprehension of the cares and of the action of the State that are now appropriate.”**<sup>285</sup>

\*\*\*

**That is the real Paul VI.** A Pope who, in defense of his Ostpolitik, always blind and partner in crime with the enemies of Christ, let millions and millions of Catholics rot in the Soviet gulags, and millions more murdered, and let those red pirates lay their hands, without ever uttering a word, upon so many Nations, and place them under the bloody Communist yoke.

\*\*\*

**And to his Ostpolitik Paul VI sacrificed also cardinal Slipyi,** Primate of the Uniate Church of Ukraine. Arrested shortly after being ordained Bishop, in 1940, and again on April 11, 1945, and sentenced to eight years in prison and forced labor in the harshest Soviet labor-camps, in Siberia, Polaria, Asia and Mordovia. After that, he was again sentenced into exile to Siberia, and, in 1957, there was **a third sentence to seven years imprisonment and forced labor,** and, at last, he suffered a **fourth sentence** with incarceration in the harshest prison of Mordovia.

Now, **even this pastor-Martyr of the “Church of Silence,”** who

spent so many years in prisons, labor camps and mental institutes, and who defended, up until his death, after tortures and Soviet prisons, his Ukrainian Catholic homeland and the Church, with unfaltering faith and indomitable Episcopal conscience, **was ordered into silence, always in the name of the Vatican Ostpolitik.** He nonetheless continued, as best he could, to denounce the absence of any religious freedom in the USSR and the bloody **persecutions** the Ukrainian Catholic Church was suffering, until in 1953, he, too, was confined in Rome, in the Vatican. With that move, **Paul VI had in fact placed him under “house arrest,” under continuous surveillance, and prevented by the Ostpolitik from working directly for his Ukrainian and Catholic people.**

\*\*\*

That same fate occurred to **Cardinal Stephen Trochta**, another **hero shamefully mistreated by the Montinian Ostpolitik**, without the minimal respect and veneration, after so many years of prison and labor camps throughout most of his episcopal life. He spent, in fact, three years at Dachau concentration camp. Having become bishop of Litomericka, in 1947, he was arrested in 1951, and underwent continuous interrogations for three years. In 1954, he was sentenced to 25 more years of forced labor, for **“treason and espionage in favor of the Vatican.”** After those tortures, he was interned in a convent, at Radvanov. It was only during the **“Prague Spring,”** in 1969, that he was rehabilitated and made cardinal; but he was still continuously followed, spied upon, prevented from exercising his functions. In April of 1974, after a last criminal interrogation, which was to last 6 hours, he suffered a break down. The following day, this hero of the Faith passed away.

**Paul VI had nothing to say about his cardinal-Martyr, whereas,**

on that very day of his passing, **he sent out a telegram to the wife of justice Sossi**, abducted by the Red Brigades [formed in 1969 to establish a revolutionary state and to separate Italy from the Western Alliance].

**And then one talks of Christian “charity!”** In Paul VI there was never a minimal sensibility or respect toward that heroic defender of the Faith, **and it is difficult to find words to stigmatize Paul VI’s shameful Papal silence and inaction.**

But that was always his cynical behavior with those that did not share his views. Neither had he ever a word, a reaction, a cry of **pain for the persecuted and the Martyrs of the “Church of Silence,” aching and bleeding to this day, sole true seed of a new Christian Russia.**

\*\*\*

Even at the international level, **Paul VI’s heart always beat to the left.** We recall, for example, his stance on the Vietnam war, when the **Catholic Van Thieu**, President of the Republic of **South Vietnam**, went on a visit to the Vatican. Paul VI treated him with dissimulated rudeness, while, on the contrary, he honored the chief of the **North Vietnamese** delegation to the Paris conference, Xuan Thuy, with a warmhearted personal mention, paying homage, in this manner, to Hanoi’s stance on peace.

The same style of **deferent collaboration with Communism**, Paul VI applied in all of his relations, other than with Moscow, with the whole of the Communist world. **And yet, in all of the Countries submitted to the Soviets, the failure of the Vatican was continuous and shameful.** In spite of that, Paul VI continued to

regard the USSR as a **“Holy Russia,”** an utopia comprised of Christianity and Socialism.

With **his pro-Communist “mens” Paul VI** turned to the Chinese communists as well. Beijing had created a **“National Chinese Church”** independent of Rome and faithful to the Communist State. It is no secret that, since 1957, 45 Chinese clerics were consecrated bishops, unbeknown to the Pope. Rome had stood silent, without acknowledging or approving. Then came the **Cultural Revolution**, which soon developed into a total interdiction of the cult. Up until 1965. Paul VI, at that stage, took his first steps granting his blessing, in his celebrated appeal to “peace” before the UN, to the admission of China into the United Nations. Paul VI, however, awaited in vain a sign of gratitude from Beijing. At that point, Paul VI raised the Apostolic representation in Taiwan to the rank of Nunciature, which meant he had taken notice of the sovereignty of the Chinese Nationalists over the territory claimed by Beijing.

In 1966, he took another **“step” in the direction of Mao**, on the occasion of the commemoration of the first six Chinese bishops. At St. Peter’s Basilica, Paul VI declared that the Chinese youth ought to know **“with what care and love We consider their present drive toward the ideals (!!) of a united and prosperous life.” (!!)**

In 1971, Communist China was admitted into the UN. The Vatican promptly saluted the event voicing its satisfaction, even tempered by the regret for the exclusion of Taiwan.

In any case, China, in 1970 had already started a great offensive against the USSR, shifting closer to the United States.

In that period, in the summer of 1970, there was a meaningful

**“occurrence.”** Marshal Tito had received Monsignor Casaroli, then Minister of the Foreign Affairs of the Holy See, at Brioni, his summer residence. The head of the protocol begged him to wait a moment in the antechamber, before the Yugoslav President would see him. The door suddenly opened, and there materialized, totally unexpected, the Chinese ambassador to Belgrade. They remained alone for a few minutes. Shortly after, however, the Vatican policy turned in the direction of China. But the Soviet reaction was not long in coming. Hence the visit of Gromyko, Foreign Affairs minister, to the Vatican. At the time, Italy recognized China and the Holy See was not indifferent. But when Monsignor Casaroli traveled to Moscow, shortly after, for the signature of the Treaty against the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the Minister for Religious Affairs reserved him a humiliating reception.

The evolution toward Beijing, however, continued. The Russians were vexed and the Russian ambassador in Rome, who in theory had no business with the Vatican, paid the Vatican various calls, during the winter of 1971-72. Paul VI oscillated between Moscow and Beijing, but when he perceived the hostility of the Russians for the contacts between Beijing and the Vatican Curia, he resorted to a kind of reservation, which was ill accepted by China. That Chinese diffidence became apparent when President Nixon traveled to China. The Holy See was not informed, and Casaroli learned the news from the international press.

\*\*\*

I relayed, here, with some particulars, only a few aspects of Paul VI's relations with Communism and **his objective of aperture and concessions to the Communist States.** Even when he speaks to the **right**, - as Congar himself wrote – **he acts, however, to the left;** and

**“facts” speak louder than words.** Thanks to his apparent neutralism and pacifism, during his Pontificate, however, **subversion, aggression, and violence** had always the upper hand, so that the **Free World** knew but defeat and withdrawal. And while Paul VI did nothing in order that this world would recover from its immorality, religious indifference, incredulity, and from its resistance to the Laws and Rights of God, he stirred the peoples not in the name of God, but of justice. And even his justicialism was far from being dictated by zeal for God, or for the salvation of the souls, but it carried all the spin of a social revolution.

I recall, here, **a few other enigmatic and perplexing “positions” of Paul VI:**

On July 29, 1969, he **traveled to Uganda**, and there, he manifested great respect toward **“Prime Minister” Obote**, a thief and bloodsucker his people would overthrow shortly after. And there, in the African heartland, **Paul VI launched a “message” of racial liberation and equality**, which carried the flavor of an appeal to a general social upheaval against the white man, **in Rhodesia, in the South African Republic, and in Mozambique.** The French daily “La Croix” 4 August 1969, wrote:

**“Paul VI did not fear to expose himself. And so he forcefully recalls, against Portugal and Rhodesia, that the Church supports the independence of the national territories. Although some delays are sometimes necessary. The Church, on her part, has contributed to the independence of the African countries affirming the dignity of persons and peoples, and making them discover their own dignity. And she provides a sample of this by Africanizing her own Hierarchy and setting out to do so where it has not been possible hitherto. No African State has anything to**

**fear from the Church, quite the contrary.”**

And it continued:

**“That courageous address aroused not only the satisfied applauses of the audience, but also a great joy amongst the African journalists present, who rushed to telephones and teleprinters to ‘spread it out to all Africa’; to say it with the closing expression of the address.”**

Paul VI, to be sure, reclaimed the independence of the Negroes and the end of all racial discriminations, as requirements of Justice and Peace. And we find nothing wrong with that, save for the fact that Paul required them in obedience to the International Institutions. Now, this meant an unconditional submission to the decisions of the UN, which, with its **“democratic laws”** (!! ) places the Law always on the side of their (Negroes’) upheaval and claims, but to the advantage of the **“Maquis” of liberation** and of every terrorism of color, as we can witness, even today, in Zaire, in Congo, and so on.

And so **Paul VI’s “anti-colonialism” was similar to that of the UN**, that is, of the great international Capitalism, of Communist imperialism, Russian and Chinese, and to that of the leftist intelligentsia. An anti-colonialism, that is, of that **“World”** that loves, supports, justifies and arms the terrorists, the slaughterers of children and women, the savages. **And Paul VI received that “World” in the Vatican.**

For example: On July 1, 1970, he welcomed the three Chiefs of the terrorist Movement of **Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde**. He admitted them to the hand kiss that followed the general audience.



In response to the surprise voiced by the media, the *Osservatore Romano* promptly wrote: **“...Any interpretation, of surprise or endorsement, had no reason to be,”** since – explained the newspaper – **“The Pope, for his mission, receives all those demanding the comfort of his blessing....”** **“And that was the case with the people at issue....”** Yes, but, to start with, that was not a general audience in the strict sense of the word, nor were those **“three”** received as Catholics, as they had been qualified in the request.

*“La Croix”* of July 9 wrote, however:

**“It must be noted that Portugal... although proclaiming itself a Catholic country, shies away from the colonial policy and the repeated teachings of the Pope as to man’s rights and peoples’ rights. It is significant that Paul VI had handed the three African leaders a copy of the Encyclical ‘*Populorum Progressio*’... But the audience of July 1 – pursues La Croix – has, before the Portuguese government, the significance of a warning: in fact, it signals to the nationalists that they are not considered impious, excluded from the Christian community, and that the Church does not approve of the colonial order established in the ‘Portuguese territories.’”**

It was plainly an apparent neutralism on the part of Paul VI, a neutralist departure from International Law and a tacit approval of terrorism, active in those regions.

I lack, here, the space to piece back together the history of that political about-turn from West to East of Paul VI’s diplomacy, of his unhurried and yet continuous rehabilitation of atheist Marxism, which went as far as to authorize Catholic Christians to join the

Communist party, as, for example, by installing, in a Czechoslovakian Bishopric a President of the **“*Pacem in Terris*” Association**, that is, an agent of Communism infiltrated into the Church.<sup>286</sup>

Certainly, Paul VI’s fixed idea on Communism was still that contained in **“*Pacem in Terris*,”** namely, the **distinction between historical movement (fixed) and ideology** (in continuous evolution)<sup>287</sup>; hence he believed Communism could evolve and improve, and for that reason he held out his arms to it, received its emissaries, cooperated with it toward an alleged **justice and peace** in the world. What a delusion!

But for that, Paul VI exposed himself to continuous **scandals**. As in that **civil marriage**, in 1965, of **Father Tondi**, his former collaborator at the Secretariate of State, who opted out of priesthood in order to join Communism. Monsignor Montini obtained for him an **extraordinary dispensation of the religious form**.<sup>288</sup> quite unusual indeed. An exceptional service to his collaborator (**his and Moscow’s**) that aroused doubts as to its finality.

Another scandal, **Paul VI** gave through **Monsignor Glorieux**, who covered his person at the time of the **“fraudulent subtraction of the ‘Petition’ of 450 Bishops reclaiming from the Council, in September of 1965, the condemnation of Communism.”**<sup>289</sup> That scandal produced its effect. **The Pope** – they said – **did not want the Council to condemn Communism; hence Communism is no longer condemned.**

**All that from his first Encyclical, “*Ecclesiam suam*,” which opened up to dialogue, reconciliation, and cooperation with Communism.** An opening that was taking shape, more and more

boldly, in his social Documents, oblivious of the issue of the persecuted Christians, of their sufferings, of their persecutions, so as not to stop or be hindered in his policy of rapprochement and cooperation with the Communist States.

The truth of the **facts** we have narrated, however, dispels any doubt. It will suffice to recall once more the forced transfer of **cardinal Mindzenty**, from “Primate” of Hungary to Rome. It will suffice to recall once more the cry of **cardinal Slipyi**, that other Confessor of the Faith, that Soviet camp runaway who, before the Synod, **cried out his indignation to the traitors who cut a peace with the persecutors, oblivious of their faithful, whom Soviet Communism persecute and torture:**

**“Out of 54 millions Catholic Ukrainians - said he – ten millions have died as a consequence of persecutions. The Soviet regime has suppressed all dioceses. There is a mountain of dead bodies and there is no one left, not even in the Church, to uphold their memory. Thousands of faithful are still detained or deported. But the Vatican Diplomacy (hence Paul VI) has chosen silence, not to upset its dealings. The times of the catacombs are back. Thousands and thousands of faithful of the Ukrainian Church are deported to Siberia and as far north as the Polar Circle, and yet the Vatican ignores this tragedy. Have the martyrs, perhaps, become incommensurable witnesses? Could we have become a drag to the Church?”**

How tragic! **The “Church of Silence”** in such a state in order not to upset the **“Silence of the Church.”** It was a **crime, however, which condemns Paul VI’s entire Secretariate of State.** Their opening to Communism **begot a world of declarations, intrigues, occurrences that make anyone who heard the thud of the**

**tombstones Paul VI caused to fall back upon the “witnesses” that sacrificed their life to Christ, turn crimson. Like his secret dealings with the then Secretary of the Italian Communist Party (PCI), Enrico Berlinguer, who, for six years, was his diplomatic agent to the communist Government of Hanoi.<sup>290</sup>**

**When Paul VI decided to build a hospital in communist North Vietnam, at war, because the United States bombarded it, causing carnage, he showed, through that gesture, that his “neutrality” was biased, invariably in the direction of Communism.**

**By now, Paul VI had become a drive belt of the Communist drive “for Peace,” that is, for the elimination of the various national armies, so that the Masonic UN could triumph, even through the worldwide expansion of Communism.**

**Hence, his appeal to China, his joy at the announcement of the “Cultural Revolution,” in spite of its plunders, its profanations, its countless massacres.**

We again recall, here, his address of the Epiphany of 1967:

**“We would like the Chinese youth to know with how much trepidation and affection We consider the present exultation toward ideals of a new, busy, prosperous, and harmonious life. We send out our votes to China, so distant from Us geographically and yet so spiritually close... And We would like to reason of peace, with the leaders of Continental China, aware as to how this supreme human and civil ideal be intimately congenial with the spirit of the Chinese People.”<sup>291</sup>**

Horrible and foolish words, which cannot hide **his unconditional**

**pro-Communism.**

\*\*\*

## **BUT PAUL VI DESECRATED FATIMA, TOO!**

Before this inhuman anguish, it would have been Paul VI's duty to perform a Pilgrimage to Fatima, and pray together with the Catholic throng of traditional faith, to impetrate of the Virgin Mary the mercy of God, and, consequently, the peace in this riotous world. But that would not be the case. **Paul VI did, to be sure, travel to Fatima, on 13 May 1967**, fifty years after the Apparitions, but he did not go there to see, but to be seen; not to hear the message of the Virgin Mary, but to take the stage; not to kneel down, but to dominate before an endless entreating crowd; not to receive celestial commands, but to impose his earthly schemes; not to implore **peace** from the Holy Virgin, but to demand it of man, but **to impose**, right **there**, in the domain of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the **schemes of the Masonic World of Manhattan**; in a word, **to stay faithful to himself**.

It was clear right from the outset. With a childish and impolite pretext, he humiliated the President of Portugal, Salazar (one of the most prestigious political Leaders of this century, and one of the major authors of the Christian civilization); first by not taking the time to meet him, at his office; then, by receiving him as any other Portuguese citizen, without suite, without photographers, without any apparatus the President's dignity would have required. And so, by humiliating the Head of State, Paul VI humiliated Portugal – the most faithful Country of Catholic faith – paying no consideration to the Nation or to her Leader. Even the progressive press underscored that act of contempt, which Paul VI had flaunted, toward that still deeply Catholic people.

He then went on to **celebrate**, in the Portuguese language, a **hasty and cold Mass**, impossible to follow, so much so that even **Laurentin defined it “stammering.”** It was noted, then, that his speeches made but brief allusion to the Apparitions of 1917, and even these were superficial and detached.

Concerned for his political and ecumenical chimeras, **Paul VI had had organized a series of “audiences” that were to take up all of his time;** particularly, an **“ecumenical meeting”** with the **“representatives of the non-Catholic communities.”** But the Lord humiliated him. Of all the invited, only two showed up, Presbyterians, with whom, besides, as these did not understand Paul VI’s speech in the French language, he could exchange only a few meaningless words, while so many good Catholics would have been more than willing to pray and speak with him.

Moreover, having no wish to visit the places of the Apparitions, at Cova da Iria, in spite of its proximity, he gave the impression that he did not believe in them. But ever since his arrival at Fatima, he had not found the time to salute, first, Our Lady of Fatima, as he immediately climbed onto the platform, saluting the people. **He had passed before the Virgin Mary without as much as raising his eyes toward Her, just as, afterwards, he declined to recite the rosary with the crowd.** Even the TV showed, and the newspapers noted, that Paul VI had recited not even a **“Hail Mary!”**

Finally: the last of the clairvoyants, Sister Lucia, asked him, weeping, a few personal moments together; **but Paul VI denied her even that.** His interpreter, father Alùeyda, in an interview to the Vatican Radio, would recount: **“Lucia expressed the wish to tell the Pope something in person, but the Pope replied, ‘See, this is not a good time. On the other hand, if you have something to tell me,**

**tell our Bishop and he will be sure to pass it on to me. Have full confidence in him and obey our Bishop in everything.”**

At this point the interpreter cut it short, saying, **“And the Pope blessed Sister Lucia as a father blesses a dear daughter whom, perhaps, he is never to see anymore.”**

**Sure! Because there are even “graces” that will not be repeated.**

At this juncture, I cannot avoid recalling that, six days earlier, on May 7, Paul VI **had found the time to meet with Claudia Cardinale and Gina Lollobrigida**, at St. Peter’s, with a completely different interest. And that ten days later, on May 17, Paul VI had heard, with great attention, the two Jewish she-Presidents of the covert Organization of the **“Temple of Understanding.”**

But it was evident that it could not be otherwise, for a “Montini” that had betrayed Pope Pius XII in order to deal with Moscow, and that, therefore, could not believe, since then already, in the Apparitions of Fatima, in the Apparitions of a Virgin Mary that, unlike him, did not come to terms with Moscow, but rather urged the world to seek conversion so as not to fall into the claws of that satanic Communism, led by Freemasonry.

And so the World, **because of Paul VI’s failings**, continued to roam the avenues of perdition, en route to punishment.

His silence and his manifest contempt of Fatima would beget no other result than that of transforming into harsh realities the threats of new **punishments** on the part of God, of a world by now slipping, unchecked, into a rotting and bloody bog, and it would then be the **Third World War, which Freemasonry will unleash again**

**through Communism, persecutor and triumphant everywhere.** And it would be an atomic war, with its unfathomable devastations, permitted by God on account of the iniquity that has by now reached the rim, and of the **on-going Great Apostasy.** And so the peoples, with the Faith, shall also relinquish their life.

But then, **why did Paul VI travel to Fatima?** Is it perhaps to substitute **his Message** to that of the **“Queen of Peace?”** The message he manifested in Manhattan, at the UN, by demanding **“Peace”** not of Heaven, but of man’s heart, to which Paul VI entrusted it?

In fact, appearing at the window of his Vatican apartment, on the very night of his return from Fatima, he said:

**“At Fatima, we have asked the Virgin Mary about the avenues leading to peace, and it was answered to Us that peace will be achieved.”**

Quite a cheek! As if to say that the Virgin Mary had encouraged him to pursue his **“Great Design”** of leading all men to building peace **not through “Prayer” and “Penance,” but through the doctrine of the “Populorum Progressio.”**

But that would be tantamount to attributing to heaven his **“Message,”** recited at Manhattan, that **“Peace”** is possible because men are good; nay, that “Peace” is the work of men, all men, fruit of their converging efforts under the world leadership of the Jewish-Masonic Organizations.

It is no use attempting to explain **his “Message.”** It is sufficient to read again **his “Prayer,” not to God but to man,** with which **he**



wrapped up his journey to Fatima:

**“Men, do endeavor to be worthy of the divine gift of peace! Men, be men (sic)!**

**Men, be good, be wise, be open to the consideration of the total good of the world!**

**Men, be magnanimous!**

**Men, get closer to one another again, with the idea of building a new world!**

**Yes, the world of the true men, which will never be such without the sun of God on its horizon!”**

An hallucinating speech, which we do not approve of, for we believe that **Our Lady of Fatima shall again be the Virgin Mary that will crush the head of the serpent-Satan.** For We believe in Her calls to **“Prayer”** and **“Penance.”** For We believe we must intensify the recitation of the **“Rosary for Peace.”** For We believe in the **“Consecration of the World to the Immaculate Heart of the Virgin Mary,”** whom Peace depends upon, for God has entrusted it to Her, in order that, **at the end of this disastrous and satanic turn to the left, “Her Immaculate Heart” may triumph over the World turned Christian again.** □

## CHAPTER VIII

### HIS “ECUMENICAL MASS” □

The debate is still open as to whether Paul VI had the authority to change the Catholic “**Mass**” in a way that would make it ambiguous, equivocal and of a Protestant content.

The fact is, **Pius V’s Bull, *Quo Primum***, still stands with all its weight and authority. I shall stay, here, within the core of the issue.

Namely: **could Paul VI change the “texts” of the Mass?** He certainly could, as a Pope, had disciplinary questions been at issue, but, **because of its dogmatic nature, the faithful fulfillment of the Holy Sacrifice” of the Mass, in keeping with the Will of Jesus Christ and in line with the traditional teaching, multi-secular, given us by the Church, Paul VI could not do it, having no “right” to “change” as much as a hair of the *Depositum Fidei*.**

Hence Paul VI was free to change some “**prayers,**” but he could

not introduce anything into the Mass that might alter the Catholic doctrine, and, therefore, the traditional Catholic Faith.

**Pope Innocent III** (1198-1216) had ruled, already:

**“The consecratory formula of the ‘Roman Canon’ has been imposed on the Apostles by Christ directly, and handed down by the Apostles to their successors.”**

And the **Florentine Council** (Session of the year 1442), in its **“Decree for the Greeks and the Armenians,”** had solemnly reiterated and confirmed the same dogmatic doctrine of Tradition, as witnessed by Innocent III. Thus the **“historical fact,”** incontrovertible, clearly demonstrates that

**“The celebration of the Holy Eucharistic Sacrifice of the Mass, and, therefore, even the formulation of the ‘consecration’, preceded by at least two decades the appearance of all of the Scriptural texts of the New Testament.”**

It is consequently censurable that, after the **Church had been using for nearly two millennia, continuously** (and without a single dispute), **the formula of the pre-conciliar Roman Canon,** it should be necessary to revise and modify it, particularly the **formula of the Eucharistic Consecration, willed by Christ... ever since the onset of the Apostolic preaching of the Gospel.**

Paul VI, having abolished the Eucharistic consecratory formula of the **Roman Canon** (which, as Innocent III and the Florentine Council had taught, was instituted by Christ and had always been used by the Roman Catholic Church), **he replaced it with his own formula** (which, therefore, is no longer that instituted by Christ), **even**

**making it mandatory, as of November 30, 1969, having introduced it in the *Missale Romanum* Apostolic Constitution of April 3, 1969.**

And yet, St. Pius V, St. Pius X, Pius XII (Pope of the “*Mediator Dei*”), John XXIII and Paul VI himself, up until November 30, 1969, had consecrated the Blessed Eucharist with the **bi-millennial** formula of the **Roman Canon**, with assurance, with compassion, with faith, in the Latin language, with subdued voice, following Canon IX of Session XXIII of the Council of Trent.

**Paul VI, with his reform of the Mass, disregarded the teaching of the (1870) Vatican Council, which reads, verbatim:**

“The Holy Ghost has promised the successors of Peter, not that they may disclose new doctrine by His revelation, but that they may, with His assistance, preserve conscientiously and expound faithfully the revelation transmitted through the Apostles, the deposit of Faith.” (*Pastor Aeternus*, July 18, 1870)

Moreover, **Paul VI disregarded also Pius IX’s teaching** (against the “*Declaratio Episcoporum Germaniae*” of January-February 1875), which reads as follows:

**“(…) Finally, the opinion that the Pope, by virtue of his infallibility, be supreme sovereign, supposes a concept at all erroneous of the dogma of the Papal infallibility. As the (First) Vatican Council, with unambiguous and explicit words, has enunciated, and as it appears in its face from the nature of things, that (infallibility) is restricted to the prerogative of the Papal Supreme Magisterium: that coincides with the domain of the infallible Magisterium of the Church herself, and it is bound to**

**the doctrine contained in the Scriptures and Tradition, as well as to the (dogmatic) Definitions already pronounced by the ecclesiastical Magisterium... Hence, as regards the affaires of the government of the Pope, nothing has been changed in an absolute way.”<sup>293</sup>**

In addition: **Paul VI**, having disregarded the two aforementioned documents of the Supreme Magisterium, went so far as to tamper with the **“Eucharistic Consecratory Formula,”** established by **Christ in person**, insinuating, to almost the entire Church, that that formula contained something that needed fixing, **violating, in this manner, also Canon 6 of the Council of Trent, which sanctioned:**

*“SI QUIS DIXERIT CANONEM MISSAE CONTINERE ERRORES, IDEOQUE ABROGANDUM ESSE, ANATHEMA SIT.”* (If anyone will have said that the Canon of the Mass contains errors, and must therefore be abrogated, let him be anathema.)

Now, having intentionally abolished that Canon’s consecratory formula, replacing it with another, specious and polyvalent, in order to please the Protestants, should Paul VI be comprised, too, under that **excommunication** of the Council of Trent?

Even cardinal Ratzinger, in his autobiography, **“My Life,”** mentions the **“... Tragic error committed by Paul VI with the prohibition of the use of Pius V’s Missal and the approval of the ‘new’ Missal, which would break away from the liturgical tradition of the Church.”<sup>294</sup>**

And he pursued<sup>295</sup>:

**“... I was astonished for the prohibition of the ancient Missal, since such a thing had never occurred in the entire history of**

liturgy. The impression was given that there was nothing to it. Pius V had established the previous Missal in 1570, in adherence to the Council of Trent; and thus it was normal that, when four hundred years and a new Council had come to pass, a new Pope would publish a new missal. But the historical truth is quite another. Pius V had limited himself to re-elaborate the Roman Missal then in use, as it had always been the case in the live course of history. Like him, several of his successors had re-elaborated that missal, without ever placing a missal in conflict with another. It was always a dynamic process of historical growth and purification in which however the continuity was never severed. A missal of Pius V, created by him, does not exist. There is only the re-elaboration he ordered, as a stage of a long process of historical growth. The new, after the Council of Trent, took on a different nature: the storm of the Protestant Reformation had taken place, above all, in the modality of the liturgical ‘reforms’ (...) so much so that the boundaries between what was still Catholic, and what was no longer Catholic, were hard to delineate. In that confused situation, made possible by the lack of a unitary liturgical normative and by the liturgical pluralism inherited from the Middle Ages, the Pope decided that the ‘Roman Missal,’ the liturgical text of the city of Rome, being positively Catholic, must be introduced wherever no reference to a liturgy that would not be at least two hundred years old could be made. Wherever such a liturgy was at hand, the previous liturgy could be maintained, given that its Catholic character could be deemed safe.”

All St. Pius V did was to extend to the entire West the traditional Roman Mass, as a barrier against Protestantism. Paul VI, abolished the “Traditional Roman Rite” since his “pastoral” aims were not for Catholics but for the Protestants. And in that

way, his **“Novus Ordo”** was but a **“remarkable departure from the Catholic theology of the Holy Mass”** (Cardinals) Ottaviani and Bacci in their **“Brief Critical Review.”**<sup>296</sup> Even *Osservatore Romano* (13 October 1967) announced: **“The liturgical reform has taken a remarkable step forward and has come closer to the liturgical forms of the Lutheran Church.”**

A liturgical turn that has all the flavor of a betrayal of the Faith! **St. Pius V retained the traditional Roman Rite, as surely Catholic. Paul VI abolished the Traditional Roman Rite precisely because it was Catholic,** in order to introduce his **new Missal, positively protestantized,** as one can easily prove.

The Catholic Faith, in fact, with respect to the Holy Mass, has always taught us that it is **“the bloodless renewal of the Sacrifice of Calvary,”** and that, **after the “Consecration,”** the bread and the wine **are really changed into the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ.**

On the other hand, **“Protestantism” does not believe at all in the “renewal” of the sacrifice of the Calvary, nor does it believe in the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist;** and that is why in their temples, when they break the bread and drink the wine, **they do it only to “commemorate” the last Supper. They perform, that is, a mere “memorial.”**

There is, therefore, an essential difference between the Catholic and the Protestant conceptions of the **Eucharistic celebration.**

That said, one may ask oneself: **How is it that today, after Paul VI’s “reformation” of the Mass,** the Protestants say they can accept the Catholic Mass, whereas, **before,** they would not accept at all that

of Pius V? Is it perhaps that the Protestants have embraced the Catholic Faith? Or is it **rather because Paul VI's Mass has embraced the Lutheran thinking?**

Let us give voice to the Protestants themselves.

**Roger Mehl**, Protestant theologian, in an article in *Le Monde* of 10 September 1970, wrote:

**“If the decisive evolution of the Eucharistic Liturgy in substitution of the (traditional) Canon of the Mass, the removal of the idea that the Mass is a Sacrifice, and the possibility of receiving the Communion under the two species, are taken into account, then there is no longer any justification, for the reformed Church, to bar their members from attending the Eucharist in a Catholic Church.”**

More incisive is the statement of doctor **J. Moorman**, Protestant bishop of Ripon, and Anglican “observer” at Vatican II, who, not without a hint of irony, wrote:

**“Reading the scheme on Liturgy and listening to the debate thereof, I could not help but think that, if the Church of Rome continued to improve the Missal and the Breviary for a long enough while yet, one day she would come up with the ‘Book of Common Prayer’.”**<sup>297</sup>

Another Anglican bishop, adopting throughout his diocese the new Catholic rite, had this to say:

**“This new rite is perfectly in keeping with our Protestant ideas.”**

The French Catholic writer **Louis Salleron** asked the fathers of



**Taizé: “Why are you saying that today you can adopt the new rite and not the ancient one?”**

**Fratel Roger Schutz**, superior of the community of Taizé, replied, (because in the new) **“the notion of sacrifice is nowhere clearly affirmed.”**<sup>298</sup>

Even the **Superior Consistory of the (Protestant) Church of the Confession of Augsburg of Alsace and Lorena**, after the assembly of Strasbourg of 8 December 1973, stated:

**“We estimate that, in the present circumstances, the faith to the Gospel and to our Tradition no longer affords us to oppose the participation of the faithful of our Church to a Catholic Eucharistic celebration. (...).The present forms of the Eucharistic celebration in the Catholic Church having been the reason for the present theological convergences, many obstacles that could have kept a Protestant from participating in her Eucharistic celebration, seem on their way to extinction. It should be possible, today, for a Protestant, to recognize, in the Eucharistic celebration, the Supper instituted by the Lord.”**<sup>299</sup>

Then, the Consistory pointed out:

**“We are keen on the utilization of new Eucharistic prayers in which we find ourselves (such as those prayers introduced by Paul VI), and which have the advantage of shading off the theology of the sacrifice, which we normally attribute to Catholicism. These prayers invite us to re-trace an evangelical theology of the sacrifice...”**<sup>300</sup>

That language means that even our theology on Paul VI’s Mass has

become a theology conformant to the Protestant doctrine. These are affirmations that call for reflection.

Sure, our faithful do not perceive that **“Protestant flavor”** in **Paul VI’s “new Mass,”** wherein the **“texts”** have equivocal expressions, which give way to various interpretations, and **wherein “suppressions” and “omissions” have been made of certain fundamental aspects of the dogma,** but there are reasons to believe, nonetheless, that **those suppressions and omissions have been certainly voluntary and calculated** by the editors of the texts.

Not by chance **Paul VI included in the “Consilium”** entrusted with the liturgical reform, **six Protestant members,** in representation of the **World Council of the Churches, the Church of England, the Lutheran Church and the Protestant Community of Taizé.**<sup>301</sup>

And that justifies the grave affirmation of cardinals **Ottaviani and Bacci,** who, in their **“Brief Critical Review of the *Novus Ordo Missae,*”** declared that **the New Mass “departs in a remarkable manner, both in the whole and in details, from the Catholic theology of the Holy Mass.”**

**We single out, therefore, here, some material parts of Paul VI’s Mass, containing grave errors.** Let us begin with the definition of **“Mass,”** such as it was presented at paragraph 7, at the outset of chapter 2 of the **“*Novus Ordo*”:** **“*De Structura Missae*”:**

***“Cena dominica, sive Missa, est sacra synaxis seu congregatio populi Dei in unum convenientis, sacerdote praeside, ad memoriale Domini celebrandum. Quare de sanctae ecclesiae locali congregatione eminenter valet promissio Christi: ‘Ubi sunt duo vel tres congregati in nomine meo, ibi sum in medio eorum.’”***

(The Lord's Supper or the Mass, is the sacred assembly or gathering together of the people of God, with a priest presiding, to celebrate the memorial of the Lord. For this reason at the local assembly of the holy Church eminently flourishes Christ's promise: Where two or three are gathered in My name, there am I in their midst.)

As one can see, the definition of **“Mass”** is limited to a **“supper”** which is then continually repeated.<sup>304</sup> **A supper, that is, characterized by the assembly, chaired by a cleric, in which a simple “memorial” of the Lord is performed,** recalling what He did on Holy Thursday.

**All this does not imply either the “Real Presence,” or the “reality of the Sacrifice,” or the “sacramentality” of the consecrating priest, or the “intrinsic value” of the Eucharistic sacrifice,** independently of the presence of the assembly. It implies, in a nutshell, **none** of the essential dogmatic values of the Mass, which constitute her true definition.

Hence the voluntary omission is tantamount to their **supersedence**, and, at least in practice, to their negation<sup>305</sup>.

**The second part, then, of that definition, namely that the Mass realizes “eminently” the promise of Christ, “There, where two or three... I am in their midst,”** creates an ambiguity, since that **“promise of Christ”** regards only, formally, a spiritual presence of Christ, by virtue of His Grace, but regards not at all the **“Real Presence,” Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity**, such as is found in the Holy Eucharist. Thus **binding that “promise” of Christ to the Mass would signify that the Mass realizes only a spiritual, not the real and sacramental, presence of Christ.**

That would be plenty to say that the **definition of Paul VI's *Novus Ordo* is heretical.** (And Paul VI, then?). However, **after reading that "Brief Critical Review" of the two cardinals, he had that "paragraph 7" amended,**<sup>306</sup> if only in part, as the **"text of the Mass" has remained as it was. Not a word has been changed.**

With that **canny reparation,** the errors of that paragraph would seem to have been fixed. **Would seem.** Not so! The **"Mass" is "supper,"** just as before; the **"sacrifice" is but a "memorial,"** just as before; the **"presence of Christ in the two species" is qualitatively equal to His presence in the assembly, in the priest and in the Scriptures.** The laity will not perceive the **subtle distinction** of the **"Sacrifice of the altar,"** called, now, **"enduring,"** but that was the **"mens" of the editors,** as **Rahner** explained in his comment to the **"Sacrosanctum Concilium" art. 47:**

**"Art. 47 contains – it was already in the Council – a theological description of the Eucharist. Two elements are worthy of attention: it is said to let "endure" the sacrifice of Christ, whereas the expressions "REPRAESENTATIO" (Council of Trent) and 'RENOVATIO' (more recent Papal texts) have been deliberately left out. The Eucharistic celebration is characterized by a word, taken from the recent Protestant discussion, namely, 'memorial of the death and resurrection of Jesus'."**

Is that not a departure from the bloodless renewal of the Sacrifice of Calvary? According to this **new definition,** the sacrifice of Christ would have taken place only once and for all, and would be enduring in its effect. But **that is the doctrine of Luther!** If the **"Sacrifice" is a mere "memorial," in which the effect of the only sacrifice endures, then Christ is present only spiritually;** and that diminishes Him, even though the expression **"in persona Christi"**

has been introduced, and the **“Real Presence”** is only symbolized in the two species.

Proof of this can be had also in the declarations of the German theologians, such as **Lângerlin**, collaborator of J. A. Jungmann, and **Johannes Wagner**, who, speaking in fact of **the new version of paragraph (7)**, say:

**“In spite of the new version, granted, in 1970, to the militant reactionaries (Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci... and us), and not disastrous nonetheless (!!), thanks to the ability of the editors, the new theology of the Mass also avoids the cul-de-sac of the post-Tridentine theories of Sacrifice, and corresponds for all time to certain inter-confessional documents of recent years.”**<sup>307</sup>

That would mean that even the current cult is still crippled.

And so, **“quid dicendum”** of Paul VI? Are we not, perhaps, confronted with a **“fact”** unprecedented throughout the history of the Roman Pontificate?

It is appropriate, therefore, to recall once more that **one must not confuse the jurisdictional prerogatives of the Supreme Apostolic Authority**, which include, to be sure, the **legislative freedom** of every Pontiff, whereas others are marked by **impassable limits**, to any Pontiff, until the end of time. Namely, the Pope has no constraints when acting in the area of **discipline**, so long as his action **does not involve the substance, and security from any contamination of error**, of any **“de fide” dogma**, as this is **“ex sese (of its own nature) irreformabile.”**<sup>38</sup>

*“Neque enim FIDEI DOCTRINA, quam Deus revelavit,.. velut  
“Philosophicum Inventum,” proposita est humanis ingeniis*

*perficienda (!)... sed tamquam DIVINUM DEPOSITUM CHRISTI... Sponsae tradita, fideliter custodienda et infallibiliter declaranda...*"<sup>309</sup>. (For the doctrine of the faith, which God revealed, has not been handed down as a philosophical invention, to the human mind to be perfected but has been entrusted as a Divine Deposit to the Spouse of Christ, to be faithfully guarded and infallibly interpreted ... — Denz. 1800)

It is thus evident that St. Pius V knew what he was saying when he mapped out a limit, **impassable “in perpetuo,”** even by all of his successors. His “*QUO PRIMUM*” Constitution did not have for an object a disciplinary issue, subject to a Pastoral Government, which might even be changed in accordance with the times, but his Constitution had for an object a **definitive Codification** of that which had been, **ever since Apostolic Times, the dogmatic substance, immune from doctrinal errors, of the Mass;** as EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE (and not “**Supper**”!) and as CELEBRATION, which is not at all, by its own nature, “COLLECTIVE” (as provided for, instead, in art. 14 of the “*INSTITUTIO GENERALIS*,” after Vatican II), but only MINISTERIAL CELEBRATION OF SACRAMENTAL PRIESTHOOD.

In fact, that “**participation of the people in the rite**” has never meant (in twenty centuries of doctrine of the Church) a “**Right of the People**” to participate actively in the Mass (as the rite itself would be invalid), but only “**concession,**” on the part of the teaching Church, to participate, through dialogue, in some portions and prayers, of merely ceremonial value, but not to those bearing an “official” and “Consecratory” value, sole prerogative of the priest, validly ordained, *conditio sine qua non*, to the “**Eucharistic Sacrifice.**”..

For these “**dogmatic reasons,**” Pope St. Pius V, in his “*QUO*

**PRIMUM**” Constitution, concludes with these solemn words:

*“Nulli ergo, omnino ‘hominum’ (and thus all, including his successors) liceat hanc paginam Nostrae PERMISSIONIS, STATUTIS, ORDINATIONIS, MANDATI, PRAECEPTI, DECRETI et INHIBITIONIS... INFRINGERE... vel Ei... ausu temerario... contraire (!)... Si quis autem Hoc Attentare Praesumpserit... INDIGNATIONEM OMNIPOTENTIS DEI ac Beatorum PETRI et PAULI, Apostolorum Eius... SE NOVERIT INCURSURUM....”*

(And if, nevertheless, *anyone would ever dare attempt* any action contrary to this notice of Our permission, statute, ordinance, command, precept, grant, indult, declaration, will, decree, and prohibition, let him know that he will incur the wrath of Almighty God and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.)

Did Paul VI, perhaps, ignore all that?

It is opportune, therefore, that I also underscore a fundamental point of the **Mass, perhaps the most injured** in that Mass of Paul VI’s: the **Essence of the Sacrifice**.

### **a) The Real Presence**

While in the **“Suscipe”** of the **Mass of St. Pius V** the **“aim”** of the **offer** was explicated, here, in **Paul VI’s new Mass** **no mention is made of it**. Hence one can say that the change in the formulation reveals a doctrinal change. In other words: **the non-explication of the Sacrifice is tantamount to the suppression of the central role of the Real Presence**. That **“Real and permanent Presence”** of **Christ, in Body, Soul and Divinity**, is never hinted. The very word **“transubstantiation”** is completely ignored.

## b) The “Consecratory Formulas”

The ancient formula of the Consecration was not a “narrative” – as is that of the “new Mass” – but a sacramental formula in the strict sense of the word. On the contrary, the new consecratory formulas are uttered by the priest as if they were an historical narration, not as expressing a categorical and affirmative judgment, offered by Him in whose Person he is acting: “*Hoc est Corpus meum*”; and not: “*Hoc est Corpus Christi.*” Hence the words of the Consecration, such as are introduced into the context of the “*Novus Ordo,*” may be valid only by virtue of the minister’s intention [the only weak spot in the author’s case. Proper intention cannot take proper effect outside a proper Mass. Proper intention is hardly demonstrated by a celebrant in violation of canon 817 (1917 Code) which forbids consecration outside of Mass. The *novus ordo missae* is by definition, not Mass.], but may also be invalid, since they are no longer valid “*ex vi verborum,*” and that is, by virtue of the *modus significandi* they had until yesterday, in Paul VI’s Mass.

With the *Sacrosantum Concilium* “Apostolic Constitution,” besides, Paul VI gave the language of the Universal Church<sup>310</sup> (against the will expressed by Vatican II itself) the final blow, stating that “*in tot varietate linguarum una (?) eademque cunctorum praecatio... quo vis ture fragrantior ascendat.*” (in such a variety of tongues one and the same prayer of all ... may rise more fragrant than incense.)

And so did he with the “Gregorian Chant,” which yet Vatican II had acknowledged as “*liturgiae romanae proprium,*”<sup>311</sup> ordering that “*principem locum obtineat.*”<sup>312</sup> (proper to the Roman liturgy) ... (it hold first place)



And so the **“new rite,” pluralistic and experimental,** would be bound to times and places; but in that way, not only the **“unity of cult”** has been severed, but also the **“unity of Faith.”**

At this juncture, we may positively conclude that a real difference exists between the **“new rite”** and the **“ancient”** one, a real **substantial difference.** In fact, there cannot be but an accidental difference if the Protestants, today, are ready to participate in the **new rite** while they still steer clear of the old one, which truly illuminates the aim of the **“Sacrifice,” Propitiatory, Expiatory, Eucharistic and Latreutic,** whereas, in such a clear manner, it no longer exists in the **“new rite,”** in which even the Offertory has gone lost. Just as Luther did, **when along with the Offertory he suppressed the Elevation,** eliminating, in this way, any notion of **“Sacrifice.”**

But even the **“modifications” of the Consecration brought about in the “Novus Ordo,”** are similar to those introduced by Luther. The essential words of the Consecration, in fact, are no longer merely the words of the form that was previously in use: **“Hoc est Corpus meum,”** and: **“Hic est calix Sanguinis mei,”** but in the **“New Mass” of Paul VI,** the essential words begin with: **“He took the bread...”** until after the Consecration of the wine: **“Hoc facite in meam commemorationem”;** just as Luther did! And that because the **“narration” of the Supper** has to be read, which is, in point of fact, **but “a narration, and not a sacrificial action, hence not a Sacrifice, but a mere “memorial.”**

Now, why in the world did Paul VI let Luther be mimicked so servilely? **The only explanation one might venture, I believe, is ecumenism,** toward a more resolute rapprochement with the Protestants. With that in mind, Paul VI invited the Protestants to be part of the **“Commission for Liturgical Reform.”** But how was it

possible that **Protestants – who do not share our same Faith – could be invited** to participate in a Commission for the **“Reformation of the Catholic Mass?”** Paul VI, with his obsession for **“universal brotherhood,”** for the sake of **unity at any cost,** had intended, with that **“Mass of his,”** to erase the lines separating Catholics from Protestants? If so, then **his was a capital error, nay, a blatant betrayal of the Catholic Faith.** The **true Christian unity** is realized only in the **“integral truth,”** in the perfect faithfulness to the doctrine of Jesus Christ, which **Peter** transmitted to all the successive **Vicars of Christ.** To vary from that **is betrayal. Period!**

The **fruits** derived from Paul VI’s **“new mass”** stand as eloquent proof. I would never come to lay down my pen, were I to document the countless **scandals** and **sacrileges, “black masses,” obscenities,** perpetrated after Vatican II, precisely due to the **“new liturgy.”**

Naturally, not all the disorders can be ascribed directly to Paul VI. They are, however, the **fruits of his liturgical revolution, and of his inexplicable tolerance** of so many ecclesiastics that profaned the churches, turning them into dancing halls, theaters, concert halls, social and Communist convention halls, without ever intervening with a punishment, without ever requiring **re-consecration** of the profaned churches. The apathy, the scandalous indifference of so great a portion of the Hierarchy before the profaned Eucharist (cabaret music, double *entendre* chants, or dull, indecent dances, etc.) cannot be said to be a token of faith in the **Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, in the Real Presence, in the Greatness of God in the Eucharist.** Nor relegation of the Blessed Sacrament to a corner of the church, almost hidden from the people; the disappearance of the Ostensory, and the suppression, nearly everywhere, of the Hour of worship, of the “Forty Hours,” of the processions of the “*Corpus Domini*”; the standing reception of Communion; the abolition of the

genuflexions before the Blessed Sacrament, etc. They have all been **innovations** that have diminished Faith in the Eucharist, consequently, the esteem and love to Eucharistic Jesus, among both clerics and faithful.

**Why?** Could anyone claim it was all **unintentional**?

Paul VI's treatment of the traditional doctrine on the Eucharist in his encyclical "*Mysterium Fidei*" certainly does not play into his defense **for all that he has done, favored and tolerated**. Nor will citation of the "**Conciliar Constitution on Liturgy**," for many of his **directives** paved the way to the arbitrary and to confusion.

As these "**facts**" demonstrate:

- On September 21, 1966, **Paul VI authorized Miss Barbarina Olson, a Presbyterian, to receive Communion, at her wedding Mass, in a Catholic church, without requiring the abjuration of her previous errors, nor confession, nor any form of profession of Faith.**<sup>313</sup>

After that scandalous "**Papal permission**" there presently followed not a few other "**inter-communions.**" The most notorious are those of the **Assembly of Medellin**, that of **Upsala** at the "**Ecumenical Council of the Churches**"; that of **Vaugirard** (Paris); an **inter-communion**, the latter, Paul VI would then disapprove, **if only for the form.**<sup>314</sup> In July, 1972, in an official decree promulgated with Paul VI's approval, cardinal Willebrands announced that, as of that moment, the "**inter-communions**" were left to the judgment of the Bishop. This meant the Bishops could authorize **Protestants** to take communion during the mass of the Catholics, and that Catholics could participate in the Protestant celebrations. Since then **it was**

**doubtful whether Paul VI still believed in the Real Presence, and, consequently, in the necessary conditions to receive Christ in the Eucharist; for had he really believed in it, he would not have granted those permissions to Protestants to receive the Eucharist, for the very reason that they do not believe in it at all.**

- On March 23, 1966, Paul VI received Dr. Michael Ramsey, head of Anglicanism, a Protestant religion. Now, the Catholic Church, up until Paul VI, had never recognized the validity of the **“priestly Ordinations”** of that religious sect. Leo XIII, in fact, in his Bull *“Apostolicae Curae,”* declared it **“irrevocable”** (*“perpetuo ratam, firmam, irrevocabilem”*) and taught that the **“Ordinations conferred according to the Anglican rite are absolutely ineffective and entirely void.”**

And yet Paul VI, on that March 23, not only considerately received Doctor Ramsey, but went so far as to place on his finger a pastoral ring – symbol of jurisdiction, that is – and then begged him to bless the crowd gathered at St. Paul Outside the Walls. [Basilica in Rome]

Now, that was a gesture that beacons a clear departure from the thought of Leo XIII and of the other Popes; and it was like an official approval of the Anglican ministries. It is proven by the **fact** that, shortly after, the Anglicans celebrated the Eucharist in the Vatican. And so did the Episcopalian Deans of the United States and Canada, come to Rome for the Holy Year, who celebrated the Eucharist in the Chapel of the Ethiopian College (on Vatican City’s territory). It was perhaps the first Eucharistic celebration of a Church that had come out of the Protestant Reformation, to take place in the Vatican. The group was composed of 75 people, led by the Dean of Washington’s Episcopalian Cathedral, the most Reverend Francis B. Sayre, and was accompanied by the Catholic archbishop of Washington, Monsignor

William Wakefield Baum. Paul VI greeted them warmly during the general audience of Wednesday, April 23<sup>315</sup>.

\*\*\*

Isn't all that very grave?

The Reverend Father Vinson, after his book: **“The New Mass and the Christian Conscience,”** published another brochure under the title: **“Messe de l’Antéchrist”**; a title suggested to him – writes he – by a text of St. Alphonse Maria Liguori: **“L’Antéchrist... tâchera d’abolir et abolira réellement la Saint Sacrifice de l’autel, en punition des péchés des homes!”**

Now, if we read again what Monsignor Annibale Bugnini, one of the inspirers and authors of that *Novus Ordo Missae*, wrote:

**“It is about a fundamental change, I would say quasi a total alteration, in certain points, an authentic creation”...**

and if we read again the **“Letter to Paul VI”** accompanying the **“Brief Critical Review of the ‘Novus Ordo Missae’,”** wherein it is said that these changes in the Mass lead one to think **“...That truths, always believed by the Christian people, might change or be hushed up without infidelity to the holy doctrinal deposit the Catholic Faith is bound to for all times,”** one would stop doubting that the *Novus Ordo Missae*

**“... represents, both in its whole and in details, a remarkable departure from the Catholic theology of the Holy Mass, such as it was formulated in Session XXII of the Council of Trent, which, by fixing definitively the ‘Canons’ of the rite, erected an impassable barrier against any heresy that would affect the**

**integrity of the Mystery”<sup>316</sup>...**

and one would convince oneself that the liturgical changes, operated in the *Novus Ordo Missae*, are neither light nor small nor simple, but that they are a “...**very serious fracture,**” since “... **what of PERENNIAL, finds in it but a diverse minor place, if at all**”<sup>317</sup> ...

In fact – we repeat – the *Novus Ordo Missae* does not manifest at all, in a clear manner, the **faith in the “Real Presence” of Our Lord Jesus Christ;** but it confuses, rather, the “**Real Presence**” of Christ in the Eucharist with His “**spiritual presence**” among us. In addition, **it facilitates the confusion upon the definite difference between “Hierarchical Priesthood” and “common priesthood of the faithful,”** such as the Protestants regard as desirable. Besides, it favors the Protestant heresy, which affirms that “**the faith of the people and not the words of the Priest render Christ present in the Eucharist.**” And the introduction of the Lutheran “**prayer of the faithful,**” too, shows well the error of the Protestants, which holds that every faithful is a priest.

And again: **that having rendered collective the “confiteor”** (which the Priest, in the Traditional Mass, recited by himself) was a resumption of Luther’s error, when he refused to accept the traditional teaching of the catholic Church, according to which the Priest is judge, witness and intercessor by God.

Graver yet was that **having reduced the Offertory into a mere preparation of the gifts, along the lines of Luther, who eliminated it altogether, precisely for the reason that the Offertory expressed, in an undisputable manner, the sacrificial and propitiatory character of the Holy Mass.** And that is one of the main reasons the Protestants can now celebrate their “**supper**” using

the text of the “*Novus Ordo Missae*,” without renouncing their beliefs.

**Max Thurian**, a Taizé Protestant, also affirmed it, saying that one of the fruits of the *Novus Ordo Missae* is that the non-Catholic communities will be able to celebrate the supper with the same orations of the Catholic Church. It is theologically possible.”<sup>318</sup>

And so **Monsignor Dwyer**, Archbishop of Birmingham and spokesman of the Episcopal Synod, could thus rightly say, “**The liturgical reform is the key of the revision. Let us not fool ourselves: it is from here, the revolutions starts.**”

**Paul VI**, therefore, with his “New Mass” imposed the errors already condemned by the Council of Trent (dogmatic and pastoral), and stood against **Pius VI**, who condemned those very errors of the Synod of Pistoia against the Jansenists, and against **Pius XII** who condemned, for example, in his Encyclical “*Mediator Dei*,” the dinner-table-shaped altar...

And so with his “liturgical revolution,” **Paul VI** realized the Judaic-Masonic aspirations of transforming the Catholic Church into a “**NEW ECUMENICAL CHURCH**” that would embrace any ideology, any religion, bundling together truths and errors. In that sense, symptomatic is **Dom Duschak**’s statement, made on November 5, 1962: “**My idea would be to introduce an ecumenical mass...**”; and asked whether such a proposal came from those of his diocese, he replied, “**No, I think, rather, that they would oppose it, as would numerous Bishops; but were it possible to put it into practice, I think in the end they would come to accept it.**”<sup>319</sup>

In any case, that giving more value to the altar than to the

**Tabernacle marked** "... an irreparable dichotomy between the presence, in the celebrant, of the Eternal Supreme Priest and that of the **Presence sacramentally realized**. Today, in fact, it is recommended that the Blessed be kept in a secluded place, wherein the private devotion of the faithful might be expressed, as if it were a relic, hence, upon entering the church, one's eyes would no longer be fastened onto the Tabernacle, but on an empty and bare dinner-table."<sup>320</sup>

But **Pius XII** had written, "**To separate the Tabernacle from the altar is tantamount to separating two things that, by force of their nature, must remain a whole.**"<sup>321</sup>

And so, in conclusion, we can say that the *Novus Ordo Missae* is not a **vertical cult**, going from man to God, but a **horizontal cult**, between man and man. The **New Church** of Paul VI is, **as already demonstrated**, the **religion of man**, to the detriment of God's glory.

Please note that:

(1) in the *libera nos* of the *Novus Ordo Missae* no mention is made of the **Blessed Virgin Mary** or of the **Saints**. Their intercession, therefore, is no longer invoked, not even at times of peril.<sup>322</sup>

(2) in none of the three new **Eucharistic Prayers** ... is there the  **tiniest hint of the suffering of the departed**, and in none is there the **possibility** of a special *memento*; which depletes the faith in the propitiatory and redemptive nature of the Sacrifice."<sup>323</sup>

(3) **Paul VI's *Novus Ordo Missae* is not even faithful to the directives of the Council**, but rather, **it openly contradicts them**, since the texts and rites, according to the Council, had to be



arranged “in such a way that would allow the holy realities signified by them to be expressed more clearly.”<sup>324</sup>.

On the contrary, the *Novus Ordo Missae* represents a collection of **changes, of deformations, of departures, of simplistic expedients,** naïve and harmful or altogether senseless. It ceases to utter – or misreads – numerous truths of the Catholic Faith.

It will suffice to list the principal titles of **points of departure and non-observance of the principles set out by Vatican II itself:**

- a new definition of the Mass;
- a suppression of the Latreutic element;
- a paucity of “orations of offering”;
- suppression of the Trinitarian formulas;
- elimination of important orations, both of the celebrant and of the faithful;
- abbreviations of Angels and Saints;
- grave dogmatic shortfall of the new “Eucharistic prayers”;
- the weakened position of the celebrant;
- the change of the religious ornaments and of the religious countenance of the faithful;
- the free spaces for the autonomous “creativity” of the celebrant;

– etc...

\*\*\*

It is impossible, therefore, to adduce as evidence that the form impressed upon the “*Ordo Missae*” had been based upon the indications of Vatican II. And the **fact that the Bishops, after attending that “normative Mass” which Paul VI had had presented to them, rejected it**, stands as a further alarm signal.

It failed to reach the **two thirds** majority of the conciliar Fathers. **That “new Mass” is thus entirely Paul VI’s doing. Behind the “*Novus Ordo*” stands only Paul VI with his “authority.”**

It must be said, in addition, that the “**Traditional Mass of St. Pius V**” **was never legally abrogated, and remains, to this day [and forever], a true rite of the Catholic Church**, through which the faithful can fulfill their holy day precept<sup>325</sup> - because St. Pius V had granted a **perpetual indult** (never abrogated), **valid “for all time” to celebrate the Traditional Mass, freely, legally, without any scruples and without incurring any punishments, conviction, or censure.**<sup>326</sup>

**Paul VI** himself, in promulgating his *Novus Ordo Missae*, **never had any intention of involving Papal infallibility**, as he himself stated in his address of 19 November 1969:

**“... the rite and related record are not per se a dogmatic definition; they are susceptible to a theological qualification of a different value..”**

And again: Paul VI himself, to the explicit question of the English cardinal Heenan, as to whether he had prohibited the Tridentine

Mass, had replied:

**“It is not my intention to prohibit the Tridentine Mass in any way.”<sup>327</sup>**

Since the (1870) Vatican Council (dogmatic) established that:

“The Holy Ghost has promised the successors of Peter, not that they may disclose new doctrine by His revelation, but that they may, with His assistance, preserve conscientiously and expound faithfully the revelation transmitted through the Apostles, the deposit of Faith.” (*Pastor Aeternus*, July 18, 1870) it must be concluded that **Paul VI’s *Novus Ordo Missae***, having introduced into **his New Church a new doctrine** – as we have previously demonstrated –, **cannot be matter of obedience** (obedience in the service of Faith and not Faith in the service of obedience), **hence any faithful is left with a theological duty of obedience to God<sup>329</sup> prior than to man, if he intends to remain inflexible in his profession of the Catholic Faith, according to the infallible doctrine of “Tradition!”** □

## APPENDIX 1

### THE OATH ON THE DAY OF HIS CORONATION □

**Paul VI, too, on the day of his “Coronation” (30 June 1963), pronounced the following oath, addressing Our Lord Jesus Christ:**

**“*EGO PROMITTO...*”**

*Nihil de traditione quod a probatissimis praedecessoribus meis servatum reperi, diminuere vel mutare, aut aliquam novitatem admittere; sed ferventer, ut vere eorum discipulus sequipeda, totis viribus meis conatibusque tradita conservare ac venerari.*

*Si qua vero emergerint contra disciplinam canonicam, emendare; sacrosque Canones et Constituta Pontificum nostrorum ut divina et coelestia mandata, custodire, utpote tibi redditurum me sciens de omnibus, quae profiteor, districtam in divino iudicio rationem, cuius locum divina dignatione perago, et vicem intercessionibus tuis adjutus impleo.*

*Si praeter haec aliquid agere praesumsero, vel ut praesumatur,*

*permisero, eris mihi, in illa terribili die divini iudicii, depropitius (...)*  
(p. 43 vel 31).

*Unde et districti anathematis interdictioni subjicimus, si quis unquam, seu nos, sive est alius, qui novum aliquid praesumat contra huiusmodi evangelicam traditionem, et orthodoxae fidei Christianaeque religionis integritatem, vel quidquam contrarium annitendo immutare, sive subtrahere de integritate fidei nostrae tentaverit, vel auso sacrilego hoc praesumentibus consentire.”*

*(Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum, p. 54 vel 44, P.L. 1 vel 5).*

**“I vow:**

- **to change nothing of the received Tradition,** and nothing thereof I have found before me guarded by my God-pleasing predecessors, **to encroach upon, to alter, or to permit any innovation therein;** to the contrary: **with glowing affection** as their truly faithful student and successor, to safeguard reverently **the passed-on good,** with my whole strength and utmost effort;

- **to cleanse all that is in contradiction to the canonical order, should such appear;** to guard the Holy Canons and Decrees of our Popes as if they were the Divine ordinances of Heaven, because I am conscious of Thee, whose place I take through the Grace of God, whose Vicarship I possess with Thy support, being subject to the severest accounting before Thy Divine Tribunal over all that I shall confess.

If I should undertake to act in anything of contrary sense, or should permit that it will be executed, Thou wilt not be merciful to me on the dreadful Day of Divine Justice (pp. 43 o 31).

Accordingly, without exclusion, **We subject to severest excommunication** anyone - be it ourselves or be it another -who would dare to undertake anything new in contradiction to this constituted evangelic Tradition and the purity of the Orthodox Faith and the Christian Religion, or would seek to change anything by his opposing efforts, or would agree with those who undertake such a blasphemous venture.”

(Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum,” p. 54 or 44, P.L. 1 or 5).

**Dreadful oath indeed!** But I believe it is no use by now to comment upon it, after the **revolution the Church had to undergo under Paul VI’s Pontificate.** A **revolution**, in fact, which left out no aspects as to dogma, Morals, Liturgy, and even Discipline. A **revolution**, nonetheless, **that had already been foreseen and courageously denounced by St. Pius X**, in his condemnation of **Modernism.**<sup>330</sup>

Today, however, one can say that **Paul VI utterly disregarded his oath** before God, pronounced on the day of his coronation, by which he coerced himself **“not to diminish nor change anything of the received Tradition, and nothing thereof I have found before me guarded by my God-pleasing predecessors”... and “to cleanse all that is in contradiction to the canonical order, and to guard the Holy Canons and Apostolic Constitutions of his Predecessors”..., “and to subject to severest excommunication anyone - be it ourselves or be it another - who would dare to undertake anything new in contradiction to this constituted evangelic Tradition and the purity of the Orthodox Faith and the Christian Religion....”**

Hence Paul VI’s **“oath”** was a **perjury**, since, *de facto*, he made it utterly null and void.

Just as when he approved the “*Dignitatis Humanae*,” Vatican II **declaration on religious freedom**, which granted, *de facto*, to any **error** whatsoever, rights that are the exclusive prerogative of **truth**, namely, of **Divine Revelation**, for it is a **declaration of false freedom**, formally and infallibly always condemned by the Magisterium of the Church, for the reason that it contradicts Catholic doctrine. In Pius IX’s “*Quanta Cura*,” for example, the condemnation of that **religious freedom** is quite clear: “...**Liberty of perdition... against the doctrine of Scripture, of the Church, and of the Holy Fathers**”; synthesis of various errors that, “**by our Apostolic authority, we reprobate, proscribe, and condemn all the singular and evil opinions and doctrines severally mentioned in this letter, and will and command that they be thoroughly held by all children of the Catholic Church as reprobated, proscribed and condemned.**”

But Paul VI, despite that **patent condemnation** of his predecessor, confirmed “*Dignitatis Humanae*” in these other terms:

“Each and every thing, established in this Declaration, has met with the satisfaction (?!) of the Fathers of the holy Council. **And We**, by virtue of the Apostolic authority bestowed upon Us by Christ, together with the Venerable fathers, in the Holy Spirit, **approve them, decree them and establish them, and that which has thus been established, we dispose that it be promulgated to the glory of God.**” (Rome, St. Peter’s, 7 December 1965. I, Paul VI, Bishop of the Catholic Church).

Barefaced rebellion against Catholic doctrine! But such enormities became **norms** of the **New Conciliar Church**, so much so that the New Church held any missionary **ministry** counterproductive.

Hence one has plenty of reasons to be concerned about Paul VI's soul, after his passing from this life to the Supreme Tribunal of God, where **he must have had to account for his 15 years of Papacy**, during which there was no consequentiality of words and deeds to the **oath** he had taken on 30 June 1963.

A Paul VI who betrayed **CHRIST, CHURCH, and HISTORY!** □ □ □

## **FIVE POINTED STAR:**

**symbol of hatred for God and religion**

Had written Karl Marx: “Religions are the opium of the people”; “The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of the people is the demand for their real happiness”<sup>331</sup>. And again, “The root of man is man himself... The critique of religion comes to the doctrinal conclusion that, **TO MAN, THE SUPREME BEING IS MAN**<sup>332</sup>.”

Lenin's hatred for religion was every bit as fierce: “**All religious ideas are an unspeakable abomination. God is a monstrous cadaver. Faith in God is a weakness**”; “**From now on we shall be pitiless with everyone. We shall destroy everything, and on the ruins WE SHALL BUILD OUR TEMPLE.**”

Lunaciarskij, Minister of Education of the Lenin government, in lieu of the religion of God proposed the religion of hatred: “**Down with the love of thy neighbor! Hatred, that's what is wanted! WE MUST LEARN HOW TO HATE. THAT IS OUR RELIGION. Through hatred, we shall conquer the world.**”



**Stalin**, too, was brimming over with hatred against Religion: **“There is no room for neutrality when it comes to Religion. Against the propagators of religious absurdities, the Communist Party can but pursue its war.”**

**Khrushchev** stayed the course of his predecessors: **“The struggle against Religion is at one with the shaping up of the NEW MAN, citizen of the Communist society.”**

And thus the Religion of God was abolished, and, in her place, there appeared a new one: the **religion of man**. The Hierarchy, the institutions, the places of cult, the rites and any reference to the Religion of God were jeered at, repressed, encroached on, abolished, eliminated, erased. Even the **images** and the **religious symbols** suffered a similar fate and were outlawed, and, in their place, there appeared a strange symbol: The **“Five Pointed Star.”**

In Soviet elementary schools, under the Communist regime, pupils received a little **“five pointed red Star,”** in whose center stood the image of six-year-old Lenin. It was the **“Lenin child”** watching over the little **“comrade,”** a symbol that, in Soviet pedagogy, **was to replace religious images.**

The **“five pointed red Star”** thus emerged as the symbol of the **“new Communist religion”**; a **“religion”** hinged upon the hatred to God, and thus to man, and the alleged aspiration of shaping up the **“new man,”** edifying a new **“Temple.”**

The **“five pointed red Star”** thus became the **“symbol”** of what most of anti-Christian one could envision and conceive; it **became the “symbol” of the systematic war to the bitter end against God, against Christianity and against the Christian Civilization.**

In fact, Communism was the political re-proposition of the **Masonic and Satanic Order of the Enlightened of Bavaria**, whose secret program it had adopted, without changing a word, turning it into the “**Communist Manifesto**” of 1848. Publication of the **Manifesto** was financed by two Enlightened: **Clinton Roosevelt** and **Horace Greeley**.

**Marx** belonged to the Cologne’s “**Apollo**” Lodge.<sup>333</sup> **Lenin** was initiated to Freemasonry by the “**Union de Belleville**” Lodge of the Grand Orient of France.<sup>334</sup> **Trotsky** entered Freemasonry in 1897.<sup>335</sup>

**Lunaciarskij** belonged to the Grand Orient of France.<sup>336</sup> **Mikhail Gorbachev** has been a member of the Masonic “**Trilateral Commission**” since 1989,<sup>337</sup> and even a member of the Masonic and Satanic “**Lucis Trust**.”<sup>338</sup> **Igor Gaidar**, leader of the “**Russian Choice**” Party, belongs to the “**Cooperation**” Lodge.<sup>339</sup> **Edward Shevardnadze**, former Soviet Foreign Minister and current President of Georgia, is the head of Georgian Freemasonry and has been an affiliate, since 1992, of the “**Magisterium**” Lodge.<sup>340</sup> **Anatoli Ciubas**, head of the Yeltsin’s Administration, has been a member of the “**Cooperation**” Lodge since 1993,<sup>341</sup> and so on and so forth.

This “**Masonic reality**” of **Russian Communism** was but a carry-over in the Masonic tradition of those that had preceded them. **Kerenski** was, in fact, the President of all the Russian Lodges, and had been in the “**Ursa Minor**” Lodge since 1912<sup>342</sup>. □

**FIVE POINTED STAR:**

**THE MASONIC symbol**

To Freemasonry, **Symbology** and **ritual** are “**everything.**” Wrote the freemason **Augusto Lista**: “**The Real initiation (...) lies entirely, and I say ENTIRELY, in Masonic symbolism and ritualism.**”<sup>343</sup>

**Masonic symbolism** on the one hand, and **iron organization**, on the other, are the two pillars upon which the Masonic edifice rests, far more than upon the pseudo-philosophical ravings no one understands and which convince no one.<sup>344</sup>

Of the myriad of symbols the freemason is confronted with when entering the Lodge, one stands out above all the others: it is the symbol of the **Five Pointed Star**, the **Masonic Symbol** par excellence. **The dictionary of Masonic symbols elevates it to the station of “Masonic symbol” by antonomasia.**

In fact, such “**Star**” is found on the Masonic **handkerchiefs, rugs** and **Lodge paintings**, on **sketches** and **representations of the Lodge**; it is observed sculpted on **monuments**, engraved on **Masonic jewels** and **medallions**; it appears on the **portraits** of the initiated, on **allegorical Masonic representations**; it shows on the emblems of the **2nd, 3d, 4th, 9th, 12th & 24th degree** of the Freemasonry’s Scottish Rite; it stands out on the **Masonic “aprons”** of the **Apprentice** and of the **Master**; it is placed in the central point of the “**collar**” worn by the **Grand Masters**; but its highest place is **at the summit of the Palace of the Grand Lodge of England** (the Freemason’s Hall), located in London’s Great Queen Street. □

## **FIVE POINTED STAR: SYMBOL OF MAN**

**The central theme and dominating sign of Masonic symbolism is**

**Man. Man inspires the entire Masonic symbology: “All the rites, fables, legends, myths refer to one and one subject alone: man. The same is true with Masonic symbolism.”<sup>345</sup>**

Now, the **true “Spirit”** is not the sentimental one, but the **initiatic** one. The freemason, in the composition of the **Square** and of the **Compass** – the most common symbols through which Freemasonry is manifested – “sees” the **Pentagram** (or five-pointed-Star) both inscribed and circumscribed<sup>346</sup> (see figures on p. 291).

And, in its explicit representations, as in the underlying occult ones, the **Five-Pointed-Star** outdoes, in consequence, all the others, even for its capacity to express and symbolize the anthropological and physical aspects, down to the most rooted and profound peculiarities of human nature.

And so the **Five-Pointed-Star**, or **Blazing Star**, becomes to **Freemasonry** the **profoundest and holiest** of its symbols.

States **Guillemain de Saint-Victor**, “**The Blazing Star is the center whence the light originates.**”<sup>347</sup> Writes **Gédagle**, “**The Blazing Star represents the light** enlightening the disciples of the Masters (...); it is, therefore, the **symbol of Intelligence and Science.**”<sup>348</sup> In a **Masonic document**, is read, “**The Blazing Star is the emblem of free thought, of the sacred fire of genius, which elevates man to lofty achievements.**”<sup>349</sup>

**Wirth** observes that the **Pentalpha** (...) is a **magical symbol** referring to the **powers of human will.**<sup>350</sup> In the dictionary of **Masonic symbols**, the **Five-Pointed Star** signifies **man.**<sup>351</sup>

Writes the freemason **Gorel Porciatti**, **The Blazing Star**, appearing

to the Comrade vanquisher of the earthly attractions, **is the star of Human Genius; it has five points**, corresponding to the head and to the four limbs of Man; **it is the Star of the Microcosm that, in Magic, personifies the sign of Sovereign Will, that is, the irresistible instrument of action of the Initiated.** In order for it to carry this value, it must be sketched out in such a manner that a human person might be inscribed into it; it must, that is, have the point pointing upwards.”<sup>352</sup> The man within the **Five-Pointed Star** is occasionally associated to the 7 symbols of the heavenly bodies. Wirth, in his book “**The Tarots,**” explains that the amalgam of these 7 symbols form a monogram “**linking to the devil.**” □

## **FIVE POINTED STAR: “SEAL” OF THE MASONIC POWER**

It is now clear why the programs of the sect are inscribed in its symbology, and why **it rarely omits to initial with its symbols its initiatives and its triumphs**, and, consequently, **the historical occurrences originating from its lodges, as well as the institutions in which it wields its occult power.** And it is precisely the **five-pointed Star, or Masonic Pentalpha, the symbol with which**, more frequently, **Freemasonry is keen to mark its own conquests and symbolize its own dominance.**

In fact, it is the very **Star** that covers the **flag of the United States of America.** It is the very **Star** that symbolized the **Bolshevik Revolution;** the very **Star** that appeared on the emblem of the **Red Brigades;** it is the very **Star** that appeared on the emblem of the former **Italian Communist Party (PCI)** and on that of the former

**Democratic Party of the Left (PDF)** [name assumed November 24, 1989 by **Italian Communist Party**]; it is the very **Star** that stands out on the **Chinese, Cuban, North Korean, Vietnamese, Algerian, Tunisian, Moroccan, and Somali flags**, and on the flags of most nations, as well as on the **insignia of the Republic of Italy**.

The **five-pointed Star** appears on the emblems of the **United States army**, as on the **Russian and Chinese armies**. The **Star** stands out also on the **Medal of the Order of the October Revolution**, the high honor formerly bestowed upon Heads of States and Ambassadors; and on the **Medal of the Order of the Patriot War**, bestowed upon all the Soviets who fought in World War II.

Even the epaulettes on the collar of Italian military uniforms carry the same significance. They were prescribed, in 1871, by the then Minister of war, **Cesare Ricotti-Magnai**, who, as a good freemason, had suppressed military Chaplains and Sunday Mass, “**replacing the cross of the Savoy with the Masonic Star.**”<sup>353</sup> His “sister” **Maria Rygier** of the French Lodge “**Human Right,**” wrote in a book, on this subject: “... (**Freemasonry**) has given Italy her most precious treasure: the holy Pentalpha, and has wanted that the **Blazing Star** were placed in good stand on the uniform of her soldiers, doubtless because **the magical virtue of the blood, shed for the Homeland, would vitalize the august pentacle.**”<sup>354</sup>

Recently, *Avvenire*<sup>355</sup> magazine, too, in a brief article emblematically titled: “**Masonic Star in the Square of the Palace,**” speaks of the restoration of the magnificent Papal square before Montecitorio Palace [Italian Parliament] “**embellished**” with a “**wealth of five-pointed Stars, that is, the most important and most widely known symbol of Freemasonry.**” And “**That Star has been shining ever since the unity of the Nation was realized by Freemasonry against**

**the Catholic Church.”** The circumstance is recalled, with exemplary clarity, also by *Civiltà Cattolica* magazine of 1887. Which reads: **“The five-pointed-star ‘is the lucky star Freemasonry presented Italy with, and, with insolent sectarian effrontery, imposed upon the armed forces, and planted on the pillars before the building of the Finance Ministry in Rome, and sneaked in everywhere, even on the coat-of-arms of the Republics and of the Monarchies, on shop signs, on the necklaces of shallow ladies, on the caps and toys of children’.”**

## **FIVE POINTED STAR: ON THE FOREHEAD OF THE BAPHOMET**

The **five-pointed-Star** shines on the forehead of the **“god”** of Freemasonry, the **“Baphomet.”**

**Alphonse Louis Constant** defines the Baphomet<sup>356</sup>: **“The Beak of the Devil.”** He then affirms, **“Let us say boldly and resoundingly that all of the initiated to the occult sciences have worshipped, worship and will always worship that which is signified by that symbol”**<sup>357</sup>.

Father **Rosario F. Esposito** writes that the Baphomet **“Was carried in procession during the initiation rite of the 29th degree (Grand Scottish of St. Andrew, in Scotland) and it is object of pseudo-adoration in numerous female initiations.** The ceremonies that were once celebrated in his honor were the same of **phallic character celebrated in honor of the Apis Ox”**<sup>358</sup>.

Writes the freemason **John Symonds**, “**abjure the faith and abandon yourself to all the pleasures (...) Glorify the Baphomet; he is the true god! Renounce Christianity and do as you please!**”<sup>359</sup>

Thus the **Baphomet** would be the god of base morals. No only. The **five-pointed-Star** would then be the **symbol** of that **foul “morals.”** It is the freemason **Gorel Porciatti** to say it: “(The five-pointed-Star), **when turned upside-down becomes the symbol of the bestiality of the foul instincts; in it, so upturned, one can inscribe the head of a beak (the head of the Baphomet!)**”<sup>360</sup>.

The freemason **Jules Doinel**, founder of the **Gnostic Church**, in his book “**Lucifer Unmasked,**” is even more explicit: “**The ‘Blazing Star’ is Lucifer himself**”; and he adds that, to each of the points of the Star, corresponds one of man’s five senses: “The **eyesight** is the perception of the Luciferian world. The **sense of smell** is of the ‘good Luciferian odor’. The **touch** is the perception of the demoniac action upon flesh and spirit. The **taste** is the anticipated perception of the Satanic bread and wine which, later on, the Rosa Cross knight is to break up and drink at the supper of the 18<sup>th</sup> degree. The **hearing** is the perception of the voice of Satan.”<sup>361</sup>

The freemason **Alphonse Louis Constant**, in his book “**Ritual of High Magic,**” writes: “**This Star indicates the presence of Satan and of the light he radiates onto Freemasonry.**” □

## **FIVE POINTED STAR: SYMBOL OF THE CULT OF MAN**



In an excerpt of the **Secret Instruction**, given by the Unknown Superiors of Freemasonry to general **Giuseppe Garibaldi**,<sup>362</sup> we read: It is thus essential, to you, Brother (...) that you do not forget that, **in our Order, no degree unveils the Truth completely**; it only renders the veil that hides it from the gazes of the curious a little thinner. To Us, invested with the supreme power, to Us alone, it strips it bare, and, inundating our intelligence, our spirit and our heart, it makes us **know, see, and perceive** that:

**1 • Man is, at one time, “GOD,” “PONTIFF” and “KING” OF HIMSELF.** That is the “**sublime secret**,” the “**key to every science**,” and the “**apex of the initiation**.”

**2 • Freemasonry, perfect synthesis of all that is human, is thus “GOD,” “PONTIFF” and “KING” OF HUMANITY.** And now it deploys its **universality, its vitality, and its power**.

**3 • As for us, grand Masters, we form the holy Battalion of the sublime Patriarch that is, in turn, “GOD,” “PONTIFF” and “KING” OF FREEMASONRY.**

Here, Brother, is the **THIRD TRIANGLE**, the **THIRD TRIPLE TRUTH** which will give your intelligence, your mind and your heart the ineffable happiness of the absolute possession of the **Truth without veils**.

(...) The total teaching of the 33 degrees of the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry is contained in this passage: “**Man is, to himself, God, Pontiff and King: he is similar to God.**”

Now, **this self-divinization of man constitutes the first “triple truth”**: the **FIRST TRIANGLE**. The second “triple truth” is the

**self-divinization of Freemasonry: the SECOND TRIANGLE. The third “triple truth” is the self-divinization of the Heads of Freemasonry: the THIRD TRIANGLE.**

**That is the deepest and most jealously kept secret by the echelon of Freemasonry. What now remains to be underscored is that this truth without veils, namely, the self-divinization of Humanity, of Freemasonry, and of the Battalion in command, constitute the three triple truths that, represented by the three gilded triangles, mutually intertwined, compose the five-pointed-Star.**

The **cult of Lucifer**, thus manifested in the **Secret Instructions** or in Freemasonry’s most reserved documents, is, nonetheless, presented

publicly almost invariably under the more presentable form of **religion of man** or **religion of Humanity**, or – which makes no difference – as **cult of Man** or **cult of Humanity**. Freemasonry makes no mystery of being promoter of this Satanic religion.

The French politician and freemason **Viviani**, insisted on this point: **“(We must) substitute the ‘religion of humanity’ to the Catholic Religion.”**<sup>363</sup>

Wrote the high initiate **Tommaso Ventura**: “Authentic Freemasonry (...) reveals a new vision of History; **it is Humanity renewing itself** that equilibrates the classes, brings the Nations together, and **brings redemption to all, not in heaven, but on earth.**”<sup>364</sup>

The Masonic magazine *Monde Maçonnique* made the following statement: **“Freemasonry makes us know that there is but one true religion and, as a consequence, but one natural religion: THE CULT OF HUMANITY.”**<sup>365</sup>

In the work **“The Deification of Humanity, or the Positive Side of Freemasonry,”** **Father Patchler** demonstrated rather well the significance Freemasonry gives the word **“humanity,”** and the use it makes of it.

That word – says he – postulates:

1) **The absolute independence of man** in the intellectual, religious and political domain; 2) **denies for him any supernatural end;** 3) **affirms that the purely natural perfection of the human descent be headed for the avenues of progress.** To these three errors correspond the three stations on the way of evil: 1) **Humanity without God;** 2) **Humanity that makes itself God;** 3) and **Humanity against God.**

Such is the edifice Freemasonry wants to build through its **religion of Humanity** or **cult of Man;** the **five-pointed Star** is the **dynamic** symbol of this path toward the Satanic aim of the **man-god.** □

## **THE FIVE POINTED STAR:**

### **ON THE BRONZE HAND OF PAUL VI**

On the **“bronze door”** when inaugurated, on the **“Leaf of Good”** in panel **12,** there appeared the Vatican II Ecumenical Council: four Conciliar Fathers between John XXIII and Paul VI.

However, while **John XXIII** and the other four conciliar Fathers were sculpted face forward, **Paul VI** (last to the right) was sculpted in profile, so as to show plainly **his left hand bearing the Masonic**

**insignia: the five-pointed Star, or Masonic Pentalpha.**

Shortly after the inauguration of that **new bronze door** of St. Peter's Basilica, I went to see it. Observing it closely, I immediately noticed that Masonic emblem on the back of Paul VI's left hand. So I rushed to see a cardinal, to report the fact. He assured me that he would promptly look after the matter. In fact, when soon afterwards I returned to Rome, just to check on that **bronze door**, I noticed immediately that **that Masonic emblem on the back of Paul VI's left hand had been scraped off**: all one could see was the live red of the copper. It was all clear! Having been discovered, the responsables of the fact **had seen, first, that the Masonic symbol were erased from the hand**, and then – as I myself could see on a subsequent trip to Rome – **had panel N. 12 replaced with another** – the current one – on which, however, the six previous figures had now become five, as anyone can see.

**How could anyone explain that a Pope (Paul VI) had his image sculpted onto that bronze door, with that Masonic symbol on the back of his hand, well aware that it would remain there as a testimony, down the centuries, and that he, Paul VI, would be judged a “Freemason Pope?”**

And certainly one cannot say that that work of the sculptor Minguzzi had been executed unbeknown to him and without his approval, since **he** was to bless it on his birthday, as later published in a **Special Insert** of the *Osservatore Romano*, **for his eightieth birthday<sup>366</sup>, and precisely with that satanic mark on his hand, a signature, as it were – and not uncommon – of his Pontificate.** □

**FIVE POINTED STAR:**

## SIGNATURE OF PAUL VI's PONTIFICATE

This statement is disquieting, as this **signature** of the **five-pointed Star**, sculpted on the back of Paul VI's hand, on the original **panel of St. Peter's Basilica's bronze door**, is perhaps the most disconcerting and reckless act of a tremendous reality that, throughout his Pontificate, kept surfacing, then to give shape to a mosaic that lay bare Paul VI's incredible and unspeakable approach toward Freemasonry, following **250 years of excommunications, admonitions, punishments, and after about 200 documents** of the Magisterium against Freemasonry, and after **16 Encyclicals** and over **590 convictions** against that sect, branded as **Kingdom of Satan** by **Leo XIII** in his 1884 Encyclical "*Humanum Genus*."

Immediately after the publication of that Encyclical, the high initiate **Tommaso Ventura**, having recognized "*Humanum Genus*" as the "**most celebrated solemn anti-Masonic document**," wrote, "**Pope Leo XIII was right on the point; he perceived what Freemasonry was; he uncovered its precise physiognomy; he lay bare its aspirations in unequivocal terms.**"<sup>367</sup>

The Church never entertain uncertainties or doubts in her struggle against Freemasonry; **it was only with the advent of Vatican II, and with Paul VI in particular**, that the **new approach reversed the previous position of the Magisterium of the Church**, adopting **ecumenical and liberal** stances toward Freemasonry up to the point of "**looking forward to a peace between the two institutions.**"

In order to shed some light on this odd aspect of Paul VI's personality, we list a few of the **facts and remarks** relating to his person<sup>368</sup>:

1) In a **Masonic magazine**, it is read: the **Grand Master Gamberini**, on the very day of the announcement of Montini's election to the Pontificate, said: **"Here is our man!"**

2) Paul VI's obituary, published by former Grand Master of Palazzo Giustiniani, Giordano Gamberini, *Rivista Massonica Magazine*<sup>369</sup>: **"To us it is the death of him who made the condemnation of Clement XII and his successors fall. That is, it is the first time – in the history of modern Freemasonry – that the Head of the greatest Western religion dies not in a state of hostility with the Freemasons."** And he concludes: **"For the first time in history, the Freemasons can pay respect to the tomb of a Pope, without ambiguities or contradiction."**<sup>370</sup>

3) In a private letter, written by a freemason friend of the renowned French writer, **Count Lion de Poncins**, expert in Masonic issues, the following passage appears, **"...With Pius X and Pius XII, we freemasons could do very little, but, 'avec Paul VI, nous avons vencu.'** (With Paul VI we won)."

4) Under his Pontificate, **Masonic laws** were introduced into Italy, such as **divorce, abortion, separation between Church and State. And there was a thorough penetration of Freemasonry even into the ordinary ecclesiastical structures.**

5) On November 13, 1964, **Paul VI laid down the Tiara (triregno)** on the altar, definitively renouncing it - **the objective of the French Revolution.** The freemason Albert Pike wrote: **"The inspirers, the philosophers, and the historical chiefs of the French Revolutions had sworn to overthrow the 'CROWN' and the 'TIARA' on the tomb of Jacques de Molay."**<sup>371</sup>

6) In the Holy Land (1954) on the Mount of Olives, Jerusalem, **Paul VI embraced Orthodox Patriarch Athenagoras I, freemason of the 33d degree.** Then, **on the eve of the closing of Vatican II, the pair lifted the mutual excommunications** launched in 1054.

7) On March 23, 1966, **he put on the finger of Dr. Ramsey, secular and freemason,** Anglican archbishop of Canterbury, **his new conciliar ring** and then, **together with him, “blessed”** the crowd.

8) **With Paul VI,** through cardinal Bea, the freemasons managed to obtain, at the Council, the **Decree on Religious Freedom,** in order to achieve the so much yearned-for realization of a **universal religion,** then set off with the mortgaging, syncretistically, of the **“Ecumenical Movement” of Assisi.** And while **Paul VI always refused to receive the Catholics of Tradition,** he continually welcomed the **members of the Masonic Lodges,** such as of the **High Jewish Freemasonry of the B’nai-B’rith** and of *L’Alliance Israélite Universelle,* which aims at **the union of all religions into one.**

9) His identity of views with the **Masonic scheme** can also be observed in the identity of his programs with the **Masonic schemes of the UN, and of UNESCO.** I would have one read, for example, **his encyclical “Populorum Progressio,”** in which Paul VI speaks of a **world bank** backed by a **world Government,** which would be ruling thanks to a **“synthetic and universal religion.”**

10) **In his address to the UN of 4 October 1965, Paul VI** uttered unusual and astonishing declarations, such as the following: **“(…) We presume to say (the UN) is the reflection of the loving and transcendent design of God for the progress of the human family on earth, a reflection in which We see the heavenly message of the Gospel (…)”**

Before he pronounced his humanist address in front of the General Assembly of the UN, **Paul VI had stepped into the Meditation Room, the Masonic sanctuary**, at the center of which stands **an altar for a faceless God**, which the Secretary General of the UN, Dag Hammarskjöld, had described as **an altar to the Universal Religion.**<sup>372</sup>

Moreover, **Paul VI should have known that the UN, at its highest levels, is directed by a Satanic sect, the Lucifer Trust (renamed Lucis Trust)**, which is the real spiritual brain of the UN and UNESCO, whose founder had for an objective **“to wipe out Christianity from the face of the earth,”** and **“throw out God from the heavens.”**

11) **A head of Freemasonry**, Minister of State of the Supreme Council of the Scottish Rite in France, Mr. **Marsaudon**, in his book: **“Ecumenism From the Perspective of a Freemason of Tradition,”** speaking of all **Pope Montini** had done, wrote: **“... The Christians should not forget that all avenues (all religions) lead to God, and stay within this brave notion of freedom of thought. One could really speak of a Revolution that from our Masonic Lodges has spread out magnificently, reaching the top of St. Peter’s Basilica.”**

12) Finally, his **Liturgical Reform** had been foreseen by the **freemason and apostate Roca**, in 1883: **“The divine cult in an Ecumenical Council shall undergo a transformation that will put it in harmony with the state of modern civilization.”**<sup>373</sup> **Roca’s plan** for the introduction of Christianity into the **Masonic Universal Religion** provided for:

a) **A doctrinal adaptation, which presupposed the equivalence of**



**all cults and religious views;**

- b) New Dogmas, *in primis* that of Evolution, which presupposes Gnostic Pantheism and Integral Humanism, for the passage of the mission of the Church from the mystical and sacramental (supernatural) sphere to the political-social (natural) one;**
- c) A rapprochement with Freemasonry;**
- d) The birth of the “priests of the future,” who are to involve themselves with the “social” and abandon the supernatural.**

And so on along this line.

**And thus Freemasonry, with Paul VI, had penetrated not only the grass-roots Church, but also the echelons of the Vatican, both clerical and secular - conceded at the highest levels.<sup>374</sup> It suffices to read chapter IV (His Opening to Freemasonry”) of our book, “Paul VI... beatified?” to realize this fact.**

\*\*\*

**Who, then, was Paul VI? It will suffice to recall that Paul VI had opposed to Pius XII’s “political-religious line” his own “political-secular line,” through which he, Pro-Secretary of State, betrayed Pius XII, setting up secret channels with Moscow and other Communist Heads of State, forgetful of, or in contempt of what Pius XI had written in his Encyclical “*Divini Redemptoris Promissio*” (1937) against Communism, clearly branding it as “intrinsically perverted” and as a “tragedy to humanity.”**

**Paul VI’s betrayal stands before the tribunal of History.**