

*"We have heard enough about the rights of man.  
It is time we heard about the rights of God." — Pope Leo XIII*

## **Counterfeit Catholics**

### **Neo-Liberalism, Modernism and the Traditionalist stance**

Copyright © 2005 by T. Stanfill Bennis

#### **Part I**

##### ***Liberalism defined***

Anytime an old heresy appears in new garb the word neo or new is attached to it to indicate it is only a later manifestation of a previously condemned error or heresy. Liberalism, Americanism and Modernism never really left the balance of the Catholic population in America; in fact all three heresies contributed to the eventual slide of Catholics into liturgical renewal and ecumenical modes of thought.

Since Vatican II, however, and the lack of any direction from Rome, all previous heresies have more or less been swept under the carpet, so to speak, by both the Novus Ordo church and the dissident sect calling itself Traditionalist. While many Traditionalists are quite conversant with Modernism, they conveniently forget that Liberalism and Americanism paved the way for the advent of Modernist teaching by clouding the dividing line between citizenship in the world and membership in the Church. The glorification of man's thinking process in the scientific, technocratic society then evolving was deemed superior to dogma of all kinds, for after all, was not man's scientific prowess proof that he could be the judge of faith? It was undignified and demeaning in Modernist eyes to accept dogma solely on the basis of faith alone and submit to the Church, the sole infallible guarantor of faith. Thus it became necessary to condemn the rationalist proposition that assent to an article of faith could be postponed until a thorough investigation of the subject matter proposed for belief was completed. Faith must precede the use of reason, the Church decreed. Otherwise, man could invest himself with infallibility and remove the need for any divinely instituted authority on earth. And so the first step was taken in the downward descent that would culminate in the abandonment of dogma and the triumph of secular humanism.

Rev. Felix Sarda y Salvany defines this aberration as an endorsement of the false teaching that "Belief is not imposed by a legitimately and divinely constituted authority, but springs directly and freely from the unrestricted exercise of the individual's reason or caprice upon the subject matter of revelation."<sup>1</sup> This, then is the essence of Liberalism as it first appeared in the 19th century. Sarda condemns Liberalism as a grave sin and cites Pope Pius IX's Syllabus of Errors, to prove the Church has condemned it as a heresy. Rev. R.J Meyer, S.J., writing 30 years later agrees that liberalism, "under every form is heresy," but emphasizes that "it is worse than simple heresy; for by

---

<sup>1</sup> What Is Liberalism, 1899; reprinted by Tan Books

rejecting the principle of authority, it strikes at the very foundation of faith, and consequently it comprehends under it all possible heresies. It is, therefore, radical and universal heresy." <sup>2</sup> While Meyer's treatment of this subject is brief, but complete, Sarda devotes an entire volume to it, delving into every aspect of this destructive error. He carefully explains that it is capable, chameleon-like, of adapting itself to any given situation, time or place, as does Meyer. That it has so adapted to our place and time is the subject of this treatise.

According to Sarda, it was the rise of individualism and especially the majority rule of democracy that paved the way for Liberalism's success. Today, individualism is supreme and human liberty knows no bounds, even going so far as to lay claim to the right to perpetrate all manner of perversion, blasphemy and sacrilege without fear of retribution. This certainly is a far worse situation than existed in Sarda's day, and it has contributed immeasurably to the mutation of Liberalism into an even more insidious form. For today Liberalism has staked its claim in the midst of the sanctuary, the priesthood, the episcopacy — yea even in the Holy Place in Rome itself. Many Catholics can see it at work in the Novus Ordo church, where it has made a mockery of authority and uprooted or diluted every doctrine. What they cannot see is that even amongst those who believe themselves to be free of the Novus Ordo contagion, Liberalism reigns unopposed, having successfully accomplished yet another metamorphosis to lend itself to the age.

Rather than openly claim themselves capable of judging doctrines and determining what measures should be taken in the wake of Vatican II, some Traditionalists surrendered their reason to floating priests who left the Church after Vatican II or the abrogation of the Tridentine Mass in 1969. This move followed Liberalist thinking, described by Rev. Sarda as the tendency to compromise, concede and submit rather than defend the faith. There is no doubt that many of the early refugees of the false V2 council debacle truly believed they were observing the virtue of obedience by deferring to these priests. But few turned to private study to assess the situation according to the mind of the Church, even in the face of scandal surrounding certain priests, which in itself demonstrates a reluctance to abide by all the Church teaches.

Eventually various members tired of submission to their priestly guides or objected to abuses and sought out other clerics or groups better suited to their own evolving assessment of the deepening crisis. Still others determined that such priests had no authority to minister to them or dictate what teachings of the Church yet prevailed and retreated to observe the faith in the privacy of their homes. All these behaviors indicate a distorted and erroneous idea of true authority and its origin, and the implicit denial of the Roman Pontiff's supreme authority and perpetual role in the Church. It almost seems as though authority is not restored precisely because then heretical error could be identified and condemned. But even the absence of authority in the Church cannot relieve Catholics of the grave responsibility to profess their faith whenever "silence, subterfuge or their manner of acting," (Canon 1325) could itself be construed as a denial of the faith. Neo-Liberalists may believe that identifying themselves as Catholics will be enough to fool others. But they nearly always share a number of traits that taken separately would mean little, but taken as a whole reveal a great deal.

Rev. Sarda and Rev. Meyer note the following qualities exhibited by the original adherents of Liberalism:

---

<sup>2</sup> Science of the Saints, Vol. 1, 1929

- A false sense of piety — pietism, religiosity, devotionism — that stresses the adherence to external trappings of the Church without the necessary interior predispositions, dependent on faith
- A certain worldliness that prefers human respect to an upright conscience and shrinks from being branded as a religious fanatic or kook
- A false idea of true charity; over-emphasizing charity towards one's neighbor at the expense of the love owed first and foremost to God and his Church
- Insistence on the observance of charity by opponents any time their position is attacked as anti-Catholic
- Refusal to accept the pre-eminence of doctrinal truth or amend their position despite irrefutable proofs
- The practice of retreat whenever their stance is assailed or opponents neglect to treat them with the affection and deference they demand
- Intransigence in the face of any attempt to induce them to recant and amend
- Overall, a disdain for anyone's opinion but their own, especially if that opinion rests on the absolute necessity of a Universal Head to render a final decision on matters of faith and morals

There is no doubt that these very same qualities are present today in Traditional neo-Liberalists.

While Rev. Sarda, were he alive today, might concede that some Traditionalists are only tainted with Liberalism, still he would have to admit that the prognosis for their full return to the faith is not good. Liberalism in any of its shades is heresy, and the longer one holds to a heresy the harder it becomes to loosen the tentacles of the error. Yet with a firm will, perseverance and pleas for God's grace and light, any sin can be overcome and Liberalism is no exception. Only one thing is required, and that one thing is recognition of Liberalism as a heresy repulsive to God, a canker that must be torn out with its roots intact and flung back into the fires of Hell from whence it came. There is one thing and one thing only keeping Catholics from achieving the unity so many claim they desire, and that thing is the work of the Devil under our very noses in the guise of Liberalism. No real progress toward a resolution of the present dilemma is possible as long as this heresy exists. Let us not go round and round in circles pretending that all that is necessary to restore the Church is a consensus of opinion, a meeting of the minds, and all will be well. Darkness cannot coexist with light; truth cannot exist side by side with error. Let us call this bane of unity by its proper name and heave it from our midst once and for all. For "He who is not with Me is against Me, and he who gathereth not with Me, scattereth." <sup>3</sup>

<p><i>"Behold, now is the acceptable time...now is the day of salvation." - 2 Cor 6:2</i></p>
---

## Part II

### ***Neo-Liberals, true charity and Canon Law***

As Rev. Sabetti explains in his work, Theologiae Morales, some can embrace heresy unknowingly by way of material heresy, which at times is not even culpable. Those who embrace neo-Liberalism without realizing the Church has formally condemned it as heresy now have the opportunity to recognize their error and make a profession of faith. In the theological world today it is far easier to become confused and miss a step than it was 50 years ago when the Church stood at the ready to condemn heresy and resolve doctrinal difficulties.

But the acid test of sincerity where culpability is concerned is an admission of guilt and the complete refutation of even a trace of the positions associated with Liberalism. This should be followed by an explanation of why one was convinced his/her position was not heretical so that a lack of culpability may be established. Without such an explanation, an evil will is presumed according to Canon 2200. Once a lack of culpability is established, a thorough study of the faith should begin, especially from those volumes that teach authoritatively and well concerning the Supreme Authority held by the primacy, the indefectibility of the Church and the charism of infallibility.

Rev. R.J. Meyer provides a helpful quote from St. Ignatius on the preferred approach to be used in dealing with those who sincerely wish to correct their errors. "Every good Christian ought to be more inclined to put a favorable construction on another's opinion or proposition than to condemn it. If he can in no way defend it, let him ask the speaker how he understands it, and in case the latter think amiss, correct him kindly. If even this does not suffice, let him try all suitable means to make him think aright and save him from error." <sup>4</sup> It should be noted, however, that Meyer offers this quote as a method to be used only in dealing with those in good faith. Rev. Sarda is of a much sterner outlook, preferring immediate and direct confrontation of Liberals of any shade with the whole truth, a tactic he describes as giving the enemy "no quarter." This teaching also is favored by St. Ignatius, so somewhere between the good faith coupled with the readiness to repent and the recalcitrance of those who refuse to repent, even knowing that Liberalism is heresy, there lies a battleground on which serious decisions must be made. Thankfully the Church has made most of those decisions for us.

Canon 2340§1 and 2, described by Rev. H.A. Ayrinhac as "an ancient legislation containing only accidental changes," <sup>5</sup> provides a guideline that will help us deal with those not willing to depart from their errors. It treats of censures for offenses other than heresy (excommunication for heresy is automatic or *ipso facto* and requires no warning of impending censure), and provides at least an example of time limits placed on those who refuse to obey the Church. Catholics wishing to retain the name would have up to a year to recant, but no one truly zealous for his own salvation would be so careless as to wait an entire year to denounce his errors. Those who wait longer than a year are

---

<sup>4</sup> Science of the Saints, Vol.I, 1929

<sup>5</sup> Penal Legislation, 1920

automatically (*ipso facto*) excommunicated under this canon for suspicion of heresy and obduracy in censure. But according to Canon 2340§2, clerics who have been suspended for six months are gravely admonished at the sixth month. If they have not recanted within a month, they are deprived of all their offices and any benefices. This demonstrates the Church's higher expectations for clerics, who have studied the faith in the seminary and are therefore held responsible for their higher learning and the obligations of their office.

Many Traditionalists had numerous opportunities to discover the Church's teaching on Liberalism and related topics. Rev. Sarda's book has been available for the past 20 years. The book Will the Catholic Church Survive the 20th Century? provides a great deal of information, and lists other resource materials to investigate. As Canon 2340§1 itself states: "If a person with obstinate mind remains under the censure of excommunication for one year, he is suspected of heresy and may be treated accordingly. A person who is satisfied to continue so long cut off from the communion of the faithful and deprived of its privileges gives good ground for doubting the soundness or sincerity of his faith." <sup>6</sup> In his commentary on Canon 2340§2, Rev. Stanislaus Woywod notes that as soon as the guilty person repents and satisfies for his offense, he may be absolved from the excommunication. Without the fulfillment of these conditions, no absolution is possible. Canon 2340§2 suggests a more rigorous approach should be taken with clerics if this law is adapted to the present situation, and this it seems would include any who have received seminary training regardless of whether they received "orders." Allowing for the many years that have elapsed in the case of most Catholics, and since today nearly all clerics have been reduced to lay status for having exercised their orders without jurisdiction, it seems more than fair to suggest a six-month limit be established for allowing the return of neo-Liberals to the Church.

If laws governing heresy and its spread seem excessive to neo-Liberals, it is because they labor under a perverted idea of charity. The Church has a strict right and a grave obligation to protect Her children from the snares of the enemy. Those unable to appreciate this fact do not abhor error as they should. As Rev. Sarda writes, "Sovereign Catholic inflexibility is sovereign Catholic charity." The Church cannot violate the Divine trust received from Our Lord to satisfy the whims of men. It is obvious from what has been said above that the granting of a year's time period to the laity and a six-month time period to clerics to reform themselves is charitable indeed considering the Church's penalties for heresy, especially in the case of clerics. It is a concession granted on account of the confusion caused by the Great Apostasy and only for that reason. Such a concession should serve to silence those who in the past have accused UDI and others of uncharitable behavior.

Because the subject of charity is today so misunderstood, it is necessary to examine the Church's true teachings on the subject, especially with a view to Liberalism. Rev. Sarda has much to say on this topic and others join him in clarifying matters. Catholics will soon see just how far from the mark they have fallen in the practice of this virtue so crucial to salvation.

---

<sup>6</sup> Penal Legislation by Rev. Aryinhac; also mentioned in the Council of Trent, Session 25, C.3

*"The first condition of charity is not to violate the truth," — Rev. Felix Sarda*

## **Part III**

### ***Charity and the rights of God***

According to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, the Fathers of the Church taught that when God delivered the Ten Commandments to Moses, the first three commandments were written on one tablet and the other seven on a second tablet. "The [first] three Commandments teach us the love which we owe to God; the other seven the duties which we owe to our neighbor and public society. The arrangement, therefore, which assigns some of the Commandments to the first and others to the second table is not without good reason."<sup>7</sup>

We must love the Lord Our God with our whole heart, mind, soul and strength;<sup>8</sup> then our neighbor as ourselves. God alone we love for His own sake. All else we love for God's sake and such love itself must be regulated by the love of God. "No honor, no piety, no devotion can be rendered to God sufficiently worthy of Him, since love of Him admits of infinite increase...The love of our neighbor, on the contrary has its limits...To outstep these limits by loving our neighbor as we love God would be an enormous crime...'He that loveth father and mother more than Me is not worthy of Me.'"<sup>9</sup>

That great Irish catechist, Rev. John Kearney, presents an excellent explanation of the proper relationship that should exist between love of God and love of neighbor. He begins with St. John's words, "Let us love God because God has first loved us," and goes on to explain that in order to love our neighbor as we ought we must first understand how it is that we must love God. He then goes into great detail about the many gifts God has given us, most importantly the sending of His Son to die for our sins, the great graces He showers on us every day, and the depths of His mercy. "From the infallible words of the Vatican Council, we learn that God is infinite in every perfection and hence He is infinitely lovable," Kearney writes. "All the gifts of mind and heart, all the sweetness of character that ever made a human being to be lovable are possessed by God with a perfection that surpasses all we can grasp in mind or picture to ourselves...Hence God deserves to be sought for and desired and chosen (dilection) and loved beyond all other beings."<sup>10</sup>

In order to love God we must will to love Him, as St. Francis de Sales says, and "instead of setting yourself to think and ask how you can love Him, practice by a continual application of your soul to God...It is not so much a question of knowing much as of doing much."<sup>11</sup> We have the motivation of love for God (His love for us and His great lovable-ness), and pleading for the graces to increase our love for Him and contemplating all His many perfections must activate these motives.

---

<sup>7</sup> Catechism of the Council of Trent; Revs. McHugh and Callan, on the Fourth Commandment

<sup>8</sup> Luke 10:27

<sup>9</sup> Matt. 10: 37

<sup>10</sup> As I Have Loved You, 1941

<sup>11</sup> Practical Piety, 1875

"A great motive has a great power over our will when the motive is pondered over and is expressed frequently to ourselves, even if only for a moment," Kearney tells us. "Hence if we desire to become lovers of God we must contemplate frequently the evidence set forth of God's great love for human beings and of His being most lovable. And we should give expression by word or act to our admiration of His care for men. This will lead us, by God's grace, to appreciate God, His will, and His friendship above all the world can give. This is charity." Kearney then goes on to quote St. Thomas Aquinas on the degrees in perfection of charity.

"On the part of the person who loves, charity is perfect when he loves as much as he can. This happens in three ways. First, so that a man's whole heart is always actually borne to God. This is the perfection of the charity of heaven, and is not possible in this life; wherein by reason of the weakness of human life, it is impossible to think always actually of God, and to be moved by love towards Him. Secondly, so that man makes an earnest endeavor to give his time to God and Divine things, while scorning other things except insofar as the needs of the present life demand. This is the perfection of charity that is possible here on the road to heaven; but it does not belong to all who have charity. Thirdly, so that a man gives his whole heart to God habitually, that is by neither thinking, nor desiring anything contrary to the love of God; and this perfection is common to all who have charity."<sup>12</sup>

Kearney points out that Christ as our king must occupy the first place in our hearts and minds and advises us to be ready to give up everything He wishes us to give up. But in order to accomplish this difficult task, God's will and desires must become *our* will and desires, His good pleasure must dominate our life, His interests must be our interests, and those things spiritual (and things temporal leading to the spiritual) good of others is God's interest and must be ours as well. And here we arrive at proper love of neighbor.

"It is manifest that the greater charity we can do our neighbor is to do him spiritual good since the soul is more precious than the body; eternity more important than time...Since spiritual charity is so important and so easily forgotten, we shall consider it...in this chapter." He then discusses the following means to practice such spiritual charity.

- Praying for others
- Our acts and life in general — the absence of worldliness in our lives, fidelity to spiritual duty, submission to superiors, publicly professing the wish to live a life pleasing to God
- Persuasion, advice or instruction
- Engaging in Catholic Action or joining some society or sodality devoted to spiritual charity
- Avoiding scandal at all costs and resisting the urge to take scandal

The supernatural love of neighbor dependent on faith is always superior to any natural reason for love. Christ's mission on earth was to supernaturalize the world, which had become base and carnal, devoted to all manner of depravity and pagan worship. He accomplished this by performing miracles that demonstrated the importance of kindness in leading others to belief. He prayed, however, before and sometimes during the performance of His miracles, and reminded the Centurion that it was because of faith that his servant was healed. Rev. Kearney does not slight the corporal works of mercy, but simply gives first place to those works most pleasing to God. We can never go wrong in attempting spiritual works of mercy: Those works which aim to lead men from

---

<sup>12</sup> Summa Theologica II-II, 24,8

error and save their souls are the most important of all. But often these will be facilitated by the corporal work of mercy, and this is the meaning of Rev. Kearney's words that the temporal good of our neighbor is to be seen to with the spiritual good in mind.

"The life which includes the contemplation of Divine truth and giving to others the truth we have contemplated is, as St. Thomas teaches, most like the life of Christ and therefore most perfect," Kearney emphasizes. We must be other Christs, following His example and the order He set concerning charity. We strive to imitate those we love the most, and if Christ is truly the King of our hearts, we will never cease to do all we can on earth to become His mirror image.

Rev. Kearney concludes his work with an admonition to have charity for our own souls, but this is not charity as one might think. He warns Catholics to resist the influence of evil, encouraging true Catholic independence of those who would lead us into sin. "When we resist the infection of evil, we are charitable to our own souls," he writes. "[But] our resistance to evil will be very much more pleasing to God if we also try to do something to eradicate the evil we meet, i.e., cause the evil to cease. If we do this for the honor of God and for the good of the soul of our neighbor, we are doing a work of supreme divine charity and of supreme fraternal charity."

Neo-Liberalists have no real idea of that great wave of charity sent out by Christ from the shores of Galilee to engulf all men. They are too absorbed in the love of their own opinions, their way of life, family obligations, their secular vocations and so forth to think much at all about any greater obligation they might have to other members of the Mystical Body. If they meet their neighbor on Sunday at their Traditionalist chapels, visit him in hospital when he is sick, light a candle in front of Our Lady's altar and take dinner to his relatives upon his death, they feel they have done their Catholic duty. The great fire felt by such as St. Vincent Ferrar, St. Joan of Arc, St. Bernard in his crusade to place Innocent II on the papal throne is something unknown to them, because they know not the light and heat of a true interior love of God. Therefore it is not in them to give freely as Our Lord gives of Himself to us. Instead they unreasonably wish to receive a sort of charity no Catholic could give, for first they expect us to absolve them from guilt, and secondly they wish to receive a love that would place them superior to God, by sacrificing His rights for theirs. The first is cooperation in heresy by approval of the error; the second is what Rev. Felix Sarda describes as "human self-love usurping the throne of the most high and demanding that worship which belongs to God alone."<sup>13</sup>

We now will return to Rev. Sarda and others of like mind to explore the conclusions one must arrive at in the journey to obtain true charity. Those who must practice charity mainly among their family members and those in the community and workplace will not be familiar with the charity required of those who actually engage in the written or spoken defense of the faith. If they view it from afar, it will often seem to them that charity is lacking altogether or is scant, indeed. In reality, such argumentation is amiss if it does not staunchly defend the rights of the Church and rights of God's truth. Catholic writers who enter unto such discussions must enter armed to the teeth to fend off the enemy, and most recently the enemy has been the neo-Liberals. Those who must fight at the front, so to speak, can give no quarter in matters of faith. If they did so they would not love God, because they would not be defending His interests. None would think anything of a man who shot down three intruders in order to save his family from certain death or injury. But let a Catholic

---

<sup>13</sup> [What Is Liberalism](#)

writer trying to defend the faith pick up the verbal equivalent of a loaded gun and point it at his enemy and the outcry deafens. In a world where man has been declared divine, God no longer has rights.

But that does not relieve all Catholics — not just the writers and the speakers — from rallying to publicly profess their love of God. As mentioned earlier, Canon 1325 proclaims that failure to profess our loyalty to Him and to His Vicar, (called by Pope Pius XII and St. Catherine of Siena "Christ on earth,") accept all the Church teaches, and give up life itself rather than abandon Christ and His Church is nothing short of a denial of faith, and that denial of faith automatically separates us from God. The Christ who counseled, "If you love Me, keep my commandments," and told St. Peter that whatever was bound on earth would be bound in heaven can scarcely count as charity failure to heed Canon Law, especially when it deals directly with matters of faith.

As Rev. Sarda so eloquently states, "The good of all good is the divine good, just as God is for all men the neighbor of neighbors...the love due to a man ought always to be subordinated to that due...to Our Lord. The degree of our offense towards men can only be measured by the degree of our obligation to Him...Therefore to offend our neighbor for the love of God is a true act of charity. Not to offend our neighbor for the love of God is a sin." And so Rev. Sarda explains that the great saints and Church Fathers did not hesitate to use imprecations, execrations, irony and colorful language to crush the heretics they opposed. And if our neighbor is displeased, outraged, humiliated or even if some material injury comes to him, if it is truly in the service of God, to protect others from dangers against faith or for the neighbor's own good, then it is not an option but an obligation. "When we correct the wicked by punishing or restraining him, nonetheless do we love them. This is charity and perfect charity." <sup>14</sup>

And to silence the hypocritical objections of neo-Liberals who point out that the Popes have forbidden Catholic writers to refrain from personal invective, harsh words and aggressive tactics, Sarda makes an important distinction. Such counsels, he observes are given to Catholic writers and journalists discussing free questions amongst themselves, not those defending truth from the attacks of heretics and those in bad faith. He scarcely envisioned the situation we face today. None of the questions featured today on Catholic discussion forums or websites are free, since free questions exclude discussion of faith and morals. "These [warnings of the popes] do not in any sense apply to Catholics waging a mortal combat with the declared enemies of the faith," Sarda asserts.

While Rev. Sarda's unflinching stance against Liberals and heretics of every flavor may surprise Catholics today, another author has taken this duty to oppose heretical error and its proponents even further. In the 1940s, Rev. Joseph Lilley took on those who sounded very much like neo-Liberals. These individuals protested that the jealous God who wreaks vengeance on His enemies in the Old Testament cannot be reconciled with His merciful Son in the New Testament. Sounding very much like Sarda, Lilley explains that we cannot possibly "love God and His truth without detesting falsehood...God hates evil and falsehood; otherwise He could not be God. He necessarily avenges evil that is willful and unrepented. He is necessarily a jealous God...To love any creature more than God is a profound disorder which God cannot but hate." <sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> [What Is Liberalism](#)

<sup>15</sup> "The Sacred Duty of Hating and Imprecating," written for [The American Ecclesiastical Review](#) in October, 1946

Lilley cites certain Psalms contained in the Breviary as examples of the imprecations referred to, pointing out that priests would scarcely be required to recite the Divine Office daily if a vengeful, angry God was represented there. He notes that other passages of the Old Testament encourage love of the brethren and repudiate vengeance. Christ's condemnation of the Pharisees and St. Paul's denunciation of the high priest, to mention a few of the passages quoted, also are referred to as examples of giving the avowed enemy no quarter. If God is to be loved perfectly, those who love him are bound to hate what He hates, as stated in Psalm 138:12. "[St. Thomas] says that cursing or wishing evil on others for its own sake is evil, but to wish it on them per accidens, for the sake of their emendation or to safeguard society or to restore the disturbed balance of justice is perfectly licit," (Summa II-II, q. 76, a. 1). But St. Thomas teaches, Lilley explains, that it is not the sinner that is hated but the guilt of the sinner and the offense it gives to God. The nature of the sinner and guilt of the sin are to be separated and only the guilt to be hated, (hate the sin, love the sinner - Summa, II-II, q. 25, a. 6.)

Lilley concludes by affirming that we may indeed use imprecations against those who promote anti-Christian doctrines and "rob the unwary of both faith and morals." Now it would be ill advised, owing to the danger of excess involved, to counsel Catholics to take up cursing the enemies of religion as a sort of pastime. But as Rev. Sarda also says, such language has its place and can be used to dispatch the enemy without fear of offending God. That such language is not in use proves that either Catholics cannot comprehend the gravity of the crisis in the Church and its true origins, do not grasp the concept that true charity is owed primarily to God, are prevented by human respect from practicing it or all of the above. Why is this true? Because Catholics do not study the faith at all or study it from sources not approved by the Church. Or if study is undertaken, the scholastic method is not used, allowing the student to make choices based solely on his/her own judgment. Rev. Kearney, in treating of God's glory in his above-mentioned work, emphasizes the necessity of study, contemplation, spiritual reading and instruction. Catholic Action manuals stress the absolute necessity of study and interior formation in order to crusade successfully to win souls to Christ and defend the faith. And if such serious study and instruction was required in the heyday of the Church, imagine what is expected of us today.

It seems ironic that the very errors responsible for the Church's demise now impede Her restoration. The lack of an interior life, forgetfulness of true love of God, emphasis on external religion all worked together to culminate in the false Vatican II council, where the "glory of God [became] man alive."<sup>16</sup> Man is the abomination setting himself up in the holy place once occupied by God. Until he is dethroned and replaced by Christ, the King of love, whose expressed will is to reign through His Vicar over one flock, there will be no end to this, the most disastrous epoch in Church history. "Return to Me, and I will return to you, saith the Lord of Hosts...and I will rebuke for your sakes the devourer."<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Paul 6's speech to the U.N., Oct. 4, 1965

<sup>17</sup> Malachias 3:7,11

*"The danger is present almost in the very veins and heart of the Church, whose injury is the more certain, the more intimate is their knowledge of Her." — Pope St. Pius X*

## **Part IV**

### ***The new face of Modernism***

You've heard the old saw that a lie repeated often enough is accepted as the truth. When Rev. Altenbach in the 1970s began crusading for the restoration of the Catholic Mass he revived the phrase "It is the Mass that matters." Latin Mass enthusiasts have mouthed that same phrase for the past three decades. Ironically, it was never a Catholic phrase to begin with. In the Catholic Encyclopedia under "Mass," Adrian Fortescue ascribes its origins to the Reformers, not 16th century Catholics. And there's the rub.

Ever since the "Latin Mass" movement began, those rallying behind the priests who declined to celebrate the Novus Ordo believed anything and everything these priests had to say, no questions asked. The priests did not teach adult catechism, ordered by the pre-1959 popes they presumably accepted as their superiors, even though knowledge of the Faith was at an all-time low. They did not organize Catholics into Catholic Action groups to assist them, to help re-establish Christ's Church on earth, another mandate issued by pre-V2 popes. Answering to no one but their parishioners, they engaged in a form of trusteeism, condemned by the Church in the 1800s. They celebrated the Mass and sometimes organized children's catechism classes and traditional schools. But because no one had received the proper training to teach in these schools, the dogma taught children often was only as accurate as the understanding of the adult teaching. In general, these priests operated on the principal that Christ had commissioned them to "Go, therefore and celebrate the Mass." This of course is not what He said. He ordered His Apostles to "Go therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them..." Notice that the administration of the Sacraments is secondary to teaching. Catechumens in the early centuries studied for two years before being admitted into the Church and during their catechumenate were allowed to stay only until the Gospel and Sermon at Mass, then were required to leave. If objections arise in Traditionalist ranks, objectors are reminded that after all, they have the Mass. But that also is a fallacy.

### **Fideism fosters Modernism**

Traditionalists so-called have the APPEARANCE of Mass and Sacraments, no more. Why? The answer is obvious from revealed truth and the infallible magisterium itself. The answer SHOULD be obvious merely based on the circumstances existing today. If Catholics would do their homework, they would discover that the Traditionalist label used to distinguish "Latin-Mass Catholics" from NO church members was used over 100 years ago to describe a heresy condemned by Pope Pius IX — Traditionalism. This heresy, related to Fideism, pretends that Catholics are imbued with a sense of divine revelation that will guide them in discerning truths of faith; that they need not study these truths to arrive at certitude concerning what is and is not revealed. Fideists claim that certitude must depend on authority without first determining whether such authority is valid, and no better description of traditionalist reliance on floating priests is available. The Catholic Encyclopedia under this topic states that Fideism teaches there is no need of intellectual assent based on objective evidence, observing that "Denying intellectual knowledge, [fideism] ruins

faith itself." <sup>18</sup> Pascal Parente defines Traditionalism as "A philosophico-religious system, which depreciates human reason and establishes the tradition of mankind, which is bound up with language, as the criterion of truth and certainty." As a part of this heresy, Parente defines, "a worse fideism, because it is naturalistic...that derived from Kantianism." <sup>19</sup> It was the 18<sup>th</sup> century philosopher Descartes who portrayed truth as relative and subjective, something within the individual. To him the conscience was the sole judge of right and wrong, whether rightly formed or not. Descartes totally discarded the teaching of the Church that truth is synonymous with God the Father and His Son. One hundred years later, Jean Jacques Rousseau finished the equation by maintaining that man and his conscience are essentially good; there is no need to obey the laws and the teachings of the Church, only conscience.

East Indian patriot Lucio Mascarenhas recently made a remarkable discovery relating to the identification of *neo*-Traditionalism. He made known the fact that Traditionalism has evolved into the heresy also called Perennialism, but still known as Traditionalism by others. <sup>20</sup> Mascarenhas lays this heresy at the door of one Ananda Coomeraswamy, longtime friend of Aleister Crowley and a devoted curate, student and critic of Eastern art. Coomeraswamy also was the father of Rama Coomeraswamy, now a "monsignor" associated with the Society of St. Pius X. Mascarenhas also contends that, contrary to Ananda Coomeraswamy's assertions, his mother was not Catholic at all and he received no instruction in the Catholic faith. Nor could Rama have received the benefit of a Catholic upbringing considering that his mother, Luisa Runstein, was an Argentinian Jewess, according to Mascarenhas. Using the definitions offered by neo-Traditionalists themselves Mascarenhas arrived at the following conclusions.

This heresy "did not originate among true pagans, but among apostates from the pseudo-Christian sects who wished to return to and restore paganism...[Ananda]Coomeraswamy sees the world divided into two camps or parties: those for God and those against Christianity. <sup>21</sup> Christianity itself represents the Tradition of Truth that God first imparted to Adam and Eve in the Garden, before their Fall, when they were on intimate terms with Him. It was continued in the traditions of a Savior-Redeemer to come, again imparted by Him to Adam and Eve after the Fall, and continued by Abel, Seth, and their descendants, by Methuselah and Enoch, and by Noe, Shem and Japhetha, by Abram, Isaac and Jacob-Israel, by Moses, Josue and the line of the prophets and judges down to Samuel, by Kings David and Solomon, by the prophets, and by Christ Himself, the Incarnate, Theandric God.

"On the opposite side is the False Tradition, made by rebellious man. Before the Deluge, men had rebelled also, but this Tradition, which originates fundamentally in the Rebellion of Satan, once the Angel of Light, and his allies the Fallen Angels, was continued after the Deluge, in the Tradition of Ham, Canaan, and of Nimrod, etc. Most of the ancient Paganisms — e.g. Hinduism, the native paganisms of the Greeks, Egyptians, Romans, Celts, Teutons, Shintoism, Taoism, Vodunism, the sundry 'Animisms,' etc. — demonstrate a sharp similarity and prove a common origin in the rebellious Tradition of Paganism and Idolatry since the commencement of the Post-Deluvian period." He includes among these systems "various Greek philosophies such as Zoroastrianism,

---

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.newadvent.org/>

<sup>19</sup> *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology*, 1951

<sup>20</sup> For more information, e-mail Mr. Mascarenhas at [prakashjm45@yahoo.com](mailto:prakashjm45@yahoo.com)

<sup>21</sup> St. Augustine wrote of this in his *City of God*

Jainism and Buddhism, Sikhism, etc.” Mascarenhas ends by telling us that Perennialism pretends that both traditions originated in one Tradition, and has as its aim the reunion of the two Traditions.

This explains why the five antipopes, Roncalli through Ratzinger have championed ecumenism and the amalgamation of the world’s religions. Rama Coomeraswamy would include all who “are ‘invincibly ignorant’ in the ‘soul of the Church,’” reminding readers that, “certainly before the coming of Christ, the ark of salvation had to take other forms.”<sup>22</sup> That these forms encompassed only the Children of Israel, from Adam to Christ, and their One, True God, from whom we inherited the Promise as “spiritual Semites,”<sup>23</sup> is never mentioned by Coomeraswamy. He then quotes various Fathers of the Church to support his views, namely St. Augustine, and focuses on Augustine’s use of “the human race” versus the Jewish race, in the following quote: “The very thing that is now called the Christian religion was not wanting among the ancients from the beginning of the human race until Christ came in the flesh, after which the true religion, which had already existed, began to be called ‘Christian.’” He provides no source for this quote, so its accuracy is uncertain. The sleight of hand Coomeraswamy plays with this quote and other works of the Fathers and saints and his omission of vital distinctions is fatal to Catholic doctrine. It is Modernist to the core and, centuries before Modernism was condemned, it was censured by Pope Paul IV in Cum ex. There the opening paragraph of the Bull condemns those “corrupting the sense of the Holy Scriptures with cunning inventions.”

Karol Wojtyla used the same approach in his first “encyclical,”<sup>24</sup> quoting St. Justin completely out of context to proclaim: “The Fathers of the Church rightly saw in the various religions as it were so many reflections of the *one truth*, “seeds of the Word,” attesting that though the routes taken may be different, there is but one single goal to which the human spirit as expressed in its quest for God...tending towards God.”<sup>25</sup> Both men fail to mention that everything changed with the fulfillment of the Old Covenant and the birth of Christ. No longer was there any confusion concerning the means necessary to salvation. Coomeraswamy also quotes St. Justin in defense of this teaching. But selective passages of this Church Father will not change the one statement *not* quoted, which brings all into focus: “The truth which men in all lands have rightly spoken belong to us Christians...All writers by means of the engrafted seed of the Word planted in them had a dim glimpse of the truth. For the seed of something and its imitation, given in proportion to one’s capacity, is one thing, but the thing itself which is shared and imitated according to His grace is another.”<sup>26</sup>

Seeds may die in the ground as many did with Jews and pagans alike. God’s law — the natural law — is written on the hearts of all men, but not all heed it. In order for there to be any fruitfulness, there must be cooperation with grace. The seedling must erupt from the earth of the soul and bear

---

<sup>22</sup> Philosophia Perennis and the Sensus Catholicus, (written in the 1980s). Britons Catholic Library publisher and Christian Science “convert” (Neville) Martin Gwynne advanced this same idea of a “sensus catholicus” in his Briton’s Catholic Library Letters. Coomeraswamy testified for Gwynne at his divorce trial in the early 1980s. Gwynne’s grandfather owned the London newspaper, The Morning Post that initially published The Protocols of the Elders of Zion in the early 1900s, and later the elder Gwynne insisted the entire version of the Protocols be brought into print.

<sup>23</sup> Pope Pius XI, Mit Brennender Sorge, 1937

<sup>24</sup> Redemptor Hominis, 1978

<sup>25</sup> To fully appreciate the injustice done to St. Justin’s text, see St. Justin’s Apologia I, Ch. 46, 1-4; Apologia II, Ch. 7, (8), 1-4; 10, 1-3; 13, 3-4.

<sup>26</sup> St. Justin, Apologia II, Ch. 13

the fruit of good works for faith to exist. This is all the Fathers meant, and it is expressed quite succinctly in all the teachings of the Church throughout the centuries. Yes, as Coomeraswamy attests in denying his adherence to a Perennialism or pseudo-Traditionalism contrary to Catholic belief: Wisdom and the Word have always existed; no one is denying this. But the Word made Flesh makes all the difference in the salvation of those born in A.D. Christianity. “Truths found in other religions” will never be more than just the seed, and then only the seed that never grew. Why go looking for them at all when the branches of the mature tree bearing the luscious fruits of teaching and belief hang within our reach? And why investigate teachings proximate to heresy when the Truth abides in Christ’s Church forever?

Is it mere coincidence that Joseph Ratzinger also professed the same error while engaged in studies for his doctorate in theology? Not likely. World War II provided an excellent opportunity for those antipriests who had infiltrated the clergy and especially the teaching posts in the seminaries and Catholic universities to become entrenched in their positions with little scrutiny or opposition. The unsettled times that followed during the reconstruction of Europe served as a good cover for their continued operation. Ratzinger’s shocking account of his worldly seminary days demonstrates the laxity found post-war in many of these institutions. “We wanted not only to do theology in the narrow sense but to listen to the voice of man today,”<sup>27</sup> Ratzinger wrote in his memoirs. Dostoyevsky, Jewish author Martin Buber, Wust, Einstein and the existentialist Romano Guardini were some of the authors Ratzinger became acquainted with as a seminarian. This hunger for secular authors proved a great danger to his faith. During Ratzinger’s study of theology at the University of Munich, the future church leader expressed the opinion that the symbolism advocated by the Modernist Alfred Loisy, who questioned the credibility of the Gospels, was “far from being resolved today.” But this was not the observation that later caught the attention of his theology professor.

In studying to gain his professor’s chair at a German university, Ratzinger was required to author a scholarly tome that presented, then defended a thesis for approval by an academic committee. In the course of the academic committee’s perusal of his work on St. Bonaventure, one professor discovered that Ratzinger’s views on revelation exhibited “a dangerous Modernism that had to lead to the subjectivization of the concept of revelation.”<sup>28</sup> Although Ratzinger somehow managed to obtain the chair despite the accusation, his views on this topic need to be dissected and explained. His basic contention, according to his own later account in his Memoirs, was that revelation “precedes Scripture,” but is “not identical with it;” is something more than just what is contained in the text. He includes in the Scripture text itself the added human element, outside of God revealing — the Church (and prior to Her existence, others) interpreting Scripture as a “receiving subject,” a thing itself that is incorporated into the revelation. He identifies this as “the fundamental sense of tradition.”<sup>29</sup> As the revised edition of Imposter Popes and Idol Altars explains,<sup>30</sup> Ratzinger’s philosophy reflects only that of the world, convinced that the Sillon’s “divine democracy,” condemned by Pope St. Pius X, is the only viable form of government. In his memoirs, Ratzinger records that already the “idea of an ecclesial sovereignty of the people in which the people itself

---

<sup>27</sup> Milestones: Memoirs 1927-1977, pg. 42

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., pg. 109

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., pgs. 108-09

<sup>30</sup> See <http://www.betrayedcatholics.com/>

determines what it wants to understand by Church”<sup>31</sup> permeated Vatican II from its earliest beginnings. Although Ratzinger later was perceived as a “conservative,” his attendance at the false Vatican II council left no doubt in the minds of those defending the true Church that he was a liberal then and has not shifted his position since. In 1969, Paul 6 appointed Ratzinger to the International Theological Commission. The French publication Informations Catholique Internationales reported on the appointment, commenting that Ratzinger was “previously suspect [of heresy] by the Holy Office.”<sup>32</sup> So certainly he already was a dangerous man, and obviously had fostered the Modernist heresy since his seminary days. His observation concerning the sovereign people is yet another example of this, for it is as Modernistic as his views on Tradition. During the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the Popes repeatedly warned that the type of democracy that results in unbridled materialism and mob rule was not the type of democracy the Church judges as an indifferent form of government, but one that will lead to tyranny, even socialism. Popular acclamation of JP2 as a “saint” and the continued endorsement of collegiality, increasingly de-emphasizing papal authority and championing the “People of God” as divine in and of themselves, is indisputably the manifestation of this “divine democracy.” The genius of ancient Rome, now so clearly revived, lay in its political adaptability to syncretic religion, extending even to the Emperors’ insistence that they themselves were gods. Polytheism was the ultimate concession to the masses, as long as these emperors also were accorded their pound of flesh. Assisi and other Wojtyla-inspired and Ratzinger sanctioned expressions of religious liberty can only be viewed as a return to syncretism and preparation for a One World religion. Man is “divine,” Tradition is divine; ergo all men must become one with Tradition if they indeed be the equals of God.

And here we find ourselves referring back to the seed and the fruit-laden tree. Ratzinger would admit that the seed is the equivalent of the full-grown tree, and with the “great John Paul II” would have us believe that revelation actually contains, from “the various religions...so many reflections of the one truth...’seeds of the Word.’”<sup>33</sup> This “fundamental sense of tradition” is none other than the Perennialism or Traditionalism of Coomaraswamy and his son; it is a blatant attempt to admit to revelation the “truths” of other religions and the human experience of the Modernists, a “tradition” not intended by the Church and indeed condemned by Her; it is an evil tradition that originated “fundamentally in the Rebellion of Satan,” as Mascarenhas wrote. St. Thomas Aquinas, who Ratzinger could not stomach, tells us that supernatural truth has and retains its own existence, regardless of man’s perception or rejection of it. Subjectivism (and Augustine Bonnetty’s Traditionalism) both teach that the beliefs and practices of men and women throughout the centuries constitutes its OWN tradition, which then must somehow be reflected in revelation. The Sacred Congregation of the Index, during the reign of Pope Pius IX prescribed the following propositions to Bonnetty for belief: “Although faith is above reason, nevertheless no true dissension, no disagreement can ever be found between them, since both arise from the same immutable source of truth, the most excellent and great God, and thus bring mutual help to each other...Faith is posterior to revelation...The use of reason precedes faith and leads men to it by the help of revelation and of grace...The method which St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure and other scholastics after them used does not lead to rationalism, nor has it been the reason why philosophy is falling into naturalism and pantheism.”<sup>34</sup> God gives us our reason to find Him; He also gives us

---

<sup>31</sup> Milestones: Memoirs 1927-1977, pgs. 132-134

<sup>32</sup> Issue # 336, May 15, 1969

<sup>33</sup> Redemptor Hominis, 1978

<sup>34</sup> DZ 1649, 1650, 1651, 1652

free will, and some choose not to search or to believe what they find. Man stands *outside* of revelation; he cannot be led to it if he already is a part of it. Faith is secondary to revelation in that man cannot believe unless he first uses his reason to know and love God by reading and believing what God Himself has said. And finally, it is strange that the Traditionalists first attacked St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure, since these are the very philosophers Ratzinger esteems the least.

Both Traditionalism and Fideism bifurcated to become the parent heresy of Liberalism and Modernism, already in their infancy in the mid-1800s. And it was these two heresies that Ratzinger dallied with as a theology professor, even praising one of his professors for "A characteristic fruitfulness [which] came from the balance between liberalism and dogma." Liberalism, according to Rev. Felix Sarda, is characterized by "the absolute independence of the individual...Any institution, no matter what be its character, that is established in complete independence of the magisterium of the Faith is free-thinking...and every freethinker is a logical Liberal...Liberalism is heresy and all the works of liberalism, (are) heretical works...(these are) the greatest sins known in the code of the Christian Law."<sup>35</sup> Sarda reminded Catholics that Liberalism was condemned both by Pope Gregory XVI in Mirari Vos and Pope Pius IX in his Syllabus of Errors. Likewise Henry Cardinal Manning wrote that the Vatican Council confirmed the Syllabus as infallible, and modern theologians prior to Vatican II concurred in this statement.

While on the topic of free thought, Rev. Frederick Faber speaks of Traditionalists old and new when he describes certain Catholics who see no need to study their faith or pursue Christian perfection. "The teaching of spiritual books and the doctrines of perfection do not recommend themselves to them...They consider that unless they are under the vows of some monastic order, they should aim at nothing more than avoiding mortal sin and the edification of those around them. They are good people. They go to Mass, say the Rosary...frequent the Sacraments. Yet when anyone talks to them of serving God out of personal love to him, of constantly looking out to see what more they can do for God, they feel as if they were listening to an unknown language. They have a jealousy, almost a dislike of such truths...Such doctrines have a sound in their ears of being ultra and extravagant, poetical and fanciful, or peculiar and eccentric. Such people are completely out of harmony with a considerable and important part of the Catholic system...They think differently from the saints and holy men."<sup>36</sup> Rev. Faber finishes his commentary by lamenting that he is afraid at heart they are unbelievers.

### **Traditionalists and necessity**

Today's Traditionalists, prompted by their priests, have feigned abhorrence for and freedom from the heresy of Modernism; yet they manifest this very heresy in their actions and their obstinacy. They follow Ratzinger in spirit, at least, whether or not they claim allegiance to him or to JP2. Proof of this can be found in Pope St. Pius X's Pascendi Dominici gregis and the very Oath Against Modernism, reprinted and circulated following Vatican II by numerous "traditionalist" publications. In Pascendi, St. Pius X identifies Modernism with Fideism, which he explains as an impulse that moves one who is already religious minded through the means of a certain special sentiment to union with God. One's desires and tendencies, then, erroneously determine belief, not the assent of the will guided by the intellect. Necessity is the driving force of the Modernists, and St. Pius X explains this as follows:

---

<sup>35</sup> What is Liberalism?, 1899 (1979)

<sup>36</sup> Creator and Creature, 1857

"For them the Sacraments are the resultant of a double need, for...everything in their system is explained by impulses or necessities...The first need is that of giving some manifestation to religion; the second is that of propagating it, which could not be done without some sensible forms and consecrating acts, and these are called Sacraments...The Sacraments are mere symbols and signs, though not devoid of a certain efficacy."

How often have we heard Traditionalists attempt to explain their urgent need for Mass and Sacraments and the graces they bring? Or that for them the Sacrament of the Eucharist is essential to salvation? And when questioned as to how they know whether what they are doing is pleasing to God, have they not often responded that they simply know or "feel" they are doing the right thing? "The Modernists would be speaking more clearly were they to affirm that [the Mass and] Sacraments were given us by Christ primarily to foster the faith," Pope St. Pius X warns Catholics this has been condemned by the Council of Trent: "If anyone says these Sacraments are instituted for the nourishing of faith alone, let him be anathema."<sup>37</sup> Were the Mass or Sacraments removed as a danger to the faith from these same Traditionalists, owing to the doubtful validity of their priests, they would find others.

There also is another heresy involved here that can be traced to the Council of Basle and the heretics Wycliffe and Hus. The 1911 Catholic Encyclopedia identifies it as Utraquism, and defines it as the belief that "Man, in order to be saved, must receive Holy Communion when he wishes and where he wishes, under the forms of bread and wine...That this is of Divine precept, continued the Hussite, is further evident from tradition." The article's author, Joseph Hughes goes on to explain that reception of the Eucharist is not by necessity of means ("an imperative must") but by necessity of precept, meaning, "an obligation imposed by a command, and for good reasons that which is prescribed may be dispensed with. The Hussites contended that the Eucharist was a necessary means to salvation, so that those who died without having received the Eucharist, (the young, the insane) could not be saved...(But) the Catholic Church denies the Eucharist is necessary as a means to salvation...(it) is a precept; from it dispensations are possible."<sup>38</sup> While Traditionalists do not insist on receiving Communion under both kinds, most of them will probably tell you they need to receive the Eucharist to be saved. One well-respected Traditional author even stated as much in a work dating back to the 1970s. But even if the majority of Traditionalists only are mistaken about necessity of means, they hold an opinion that at least smacks of heresy or is proximate to it. And it is because they simply do not understand the finer points of faith that they cannot make the necessary distinctions.

Truly Modernism was a synthesis that embraced many heretical "isms." Take away the Mass and Sacraments of the Traditionalists, and what have they left? Because they have not based their faith on sound doctrine and the papacy, they are broken reeds and empty vessels.

## **Scholasticism and Sacred Scripture scorned**

---

<sup>37</sup> DZ 848

<sup>38</sup> <http://www.newadvent.org/>

The sainted pope goes onto explain that the Modernists are devoid of logic, which is why they regard dogma so lightly and scorn the scholastic philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas. In order to rebuff those who attempt to follow the Church's example and refute errors by means of Scholastic disputation, they pretended that no one, far less a layperson, could argue from Scholastic principles. This error is specifically condemned by Clement VI, that "from one matter another matter cannot be inferred."<sup>39</sup> Pope St Pius X notes: "There is no surer sign that a man tends to Modernism than when he begins to show his dislike for the Scholastic method."<sup>40</sup> The Modernists even go so far as to claim that errors can be found in Holy Scripture and as Pope St. Pius X comments, "certain arguments adduced in the Sacred Books, like those, for example, which are based on the prophecies, have no rational foundation to rest on." This it would seem is the case with Traditionalists who deny the existence of the Church, "unto the consummation,"<sup>41</sup> Christ's prophecies concerning Peter's unflinching faith and the fact that the gates of Hell will never prevail against the Church. Those who do not attend the Latin Mass, or "home-aloners" are equally guilty of denying these prophecies and disregarding dogma and its logical conclusions; of refusing to accept the clear and irrefutable proofs of faith and hence, also are guilty of impeding unity and destroying the Church. Indeed, the Pope emphasizes, this is the very target of the Modernists' assault:

"They (the Modernists) propose to remove the ecclesiastical magisterium itself by sacrilegiously falsifying its origin, character and rights, and by freely repeating the calumnies of its adversaries." One of the propositions contained in St. Pius X's Oath Against the Errors of Modernism reads: "I admit and recognize the external arguments of revelation, that is, divine facts, and especially miracles and prophecies, as very certain signs of the divine origin of the Christian religion...I accept sincerely the doctrine of faith transmitted from the Apostles though the orthodox fathers, always in the same sense and interpretation, even to us..."<sup>42</sup>

It is clear that Traditionalists believe themselves incapable of understanding and acting on such arguments. They claim that they cannot possibly assess the situation today and need not pay the slightest attention to any arguments whatsoever, whether based on divinely revealed truths or not, that would pose a solution for the crisis in the Church. They are content with their symbolism, and as long as they can pass for Catholic, this is enough for them. They have no interest in the fact, infallibly declared by Pope St. Pius X and other popes, that they have been duped by some of the most diabolical propagandists the Church has ever known. On this subject, St. Pius X writes:

"For the Modernists, both as authors and propagandists, there is to be nothing stable, nothing immutable in the Church...In the Syllabus of Pius IX, it is enunciated in these terms: 'Divine revelation is imperfect, and therefore subject to continual and indefinite progress, corresponding with the progress of human reason.'"<sup>43</sup> The Vatican Council decreed: "The sense of the Sacred Dogmas which Our Holy Mother Church has once declared [is never] to be abandoned on plea or pretext of a more profound comprehension of the truth."<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> DZ 554

<sup>40</sup> Pascendi Dominici gregis, 1907

<sup>41</sup> Matt. 28:20

<sup>42</sup> DZ 2145

<sup>43</sup> Pascendi Dominici gregis, 1907

<sup>44</sup> DZ 1800

## Rejection of the papacy

It is this council in particular and its definition of infallibility and the primacy as truths to be accepted as revealed by Our Lord that Traditionalists have especially spurned. In their "higher" understanding of how the Church must operate in "these times," they fail to appreciate the fact that in reality the situation is no different than the times encountered during the Western Schism, Reformation in England and the exile of those priests in France following the Revolution who refused to swear fealty to the state. In fact Catholics today have fewer excuses than in former times, owing to technical advances in communication and the further development of dogma.

Humility is not something readily associated with Modernism. Pride and the Jansenistic "petite eglise" (little church) mentality of previous ages (so suggestive of the traditional movement) were only a preview of the "synthesis of all heresies" that would later present itself as Modernism. And the cause of this heresy, according to St. Pius X in Pascendi was "curiosity and pride...Pride sits in Modernism as in its own house, finding sustenance everywhere in its doctrines and an occasion to flaunt itself in all its aspects...It is pride which rouses in them the spirit of disobedience and causes them to demand a compromise between authority and liberty."

While Pope St. Pius X's description of Modernist aims better fits the Novus Ordo church, inclined as it is to religious liberty, autonomy, collegiality, and de-emphasis of Tradition and dogma, he reminds us that there is another side to the Modernists, for "the admirers of symbolism are disposed to be more indulgent on this head." In other words, there are those among them who would tolerate the Latin Mass, particularly if it served their own ends. This explains how the NO and Traditionalist sects are invisibly linked and why it is possible to identify both Traditionalists and NO devotees with Modernism. It is precisely for this reason that there is talk in Rome today about absorbing the Traditionalist sect: they were never really dispossessed in the first place.

If we use the teachings of the Church to further unravel the imposture that is Traditional catholicism, Traditionalists do not respond because it is precisely this teaching that they have traded in for their "needs." Yet by proceeding methodically down the list of the teachings rejected by Traditionalists, we can gain a better understanding from what has been explained above, perhaps, of precisely how they reject it and what it means for those trying to convince them of their errors. The real root of those errors lies in their obvious anti-intellectualism and inability to think from a Catholic perspective. The cause can be laid at the door of previous generations, and Traditional "priests" are only too happy to tolerate the situation because it serves their own agenda. All their hedging, intractability, and rationalization to preserve the status quo point to only one thing: most Traditionalists are unwitting dupes in the grand design of their leaders to entirely falsify the origin, character and rights of the magisterium. Pope St. Pius X explained in Pascendi that the Modernists, by "a species of covenant and compromise" between religious authority and tradition, would use the laity to accomplish their goals. He condemns **"the introduction of that most pernicious doctrine which would make of the laity the factor of progress in the Church."** And how truly prophetic this statement would be.

## The bottom line

As demonstrated above, Traditionalists must necessarily deny the definitions of the Vatican Council, Council of Trent and those infallible truths found in other papal documents in order to

retain their position. Blinded by their attachment to symbolism they will read the above and convince themselves that if it were so, their "priests" would have told them.

By dismissing the dictates of Canon Law concerning their invalid absolution and the illicit consecration of the Host by excommunicated priests, these self-styled leaders dishonor and desecrate Christ's Body by participating in the "Mass" and lead their followers into the same sins. They give no credence whatsoever to the Fathers' unanimous concurrence in the early centuries of Christianity (TRADITION!) that the Holy Sacrifice would cease. They behave as though the Mass is independent of the truths taught by the Church, despite the fact that Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical addressed to the Anglican Church taught: "They knew only too well the intimate bond that unites faith with worship, 'the law of belief with the law of prayer,'" <sup>45</sup> another popular Traditional catch phrase that is completely misconstrued. One Traditional priest explained this phrase as follows: We pray, as we believe. And so they do. This is true because in order to demonstrate unity of worship under lawful superiors, there is a specific place in the Mass for inserting the names of pope and bishop. Yet Traditionalists cannot fill in these blanks without showing their true colors. For they must either recognize Ratzinger as pope to do it or assume, if they are sedevacantists, that there will be no pope inserted into this prayer in the Canon of the Mass, since they **believe** there can be no Pope. This was not, however, the way Pope Leo XIII stated what he addressed to the Anglicans. Catholics must believe *first*; this is the teaching of St. Thomas who explains that in order to act we must first *become*. "Being" takes place in the intellect and is better stated as "believing." In other words our thoughts and beliefs direct and determine our actions, which is only logical thinking. So if we join the law of belief with the law of prayer, belief then determines our prayer. In other words, since Traditionalists do not believe correctly, this will be reflected — has been reflected for decades — in their public prayers.

Helplessly watching truth be assailed is a terrible thing. Standing by unable to be heard while others represent themselves as Catholics and are believed is heartbreaking. And yet this sorrow was not unknown, even to the early Christians. St. Augustine speaks of this very dilemma as follows: "There is that...heartache of seeing heretics, too, using the name and Sacraments, the Scripture and the Creed of genuine Christians...how many would-be converts are driven into perplexed hesitancy because of heretical dissension." <sup>46</sup> And because of their heretical dissension, their schizoid Modernist mentality, the heads of this movement are the ones spoken of in 2 Thessalonians who rejected the truth, and as a result were sent the operation of error to believe lying. They either declined the wedding feast invitation altogether, or appeared without the wedding garment of true charity. Unless they repent and amend they will, like the guests in the parable, be cast into Hell.

---

<sup>45</sup> Apostolicae Curae, Sept. 13, 1896

<sup>46</sup> City of God