

# Catholic Candle

• September 2016 • catholiccandle.neocities.org • catholiccandle@gmail.com

## Faithful Catholics Must Be Different from the World; the “New” SSPX Wants to Fit In

Faithful Catholics must be different from the world. If we imitate Our Lord, we will not “fit in” with the world.

Sacred Scripture calls Our Lord a *Sign of Contradiction*, showing opposition between Him and the world. St. Luke’s Gospel, 2:34. If we imitate Him, we will be signs of contradiction too.

The world hates Our Lord and if we imitate Him, it will hate us too. He declared:

If the world hates you, know ye, that it hath hated me before you. If you had been of the world, the world would love its own: but because you are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.

St. John’s Gospel, 15:18-19.

At Vatican II, the Church (in Her human element) sought to make peace with the world. That is, the human element of the Church tried to become loved (or accepted) by the world and cease to be a sign of contradiction.

This is why Pope Benedict XVI described Vatican II as “an attempt to officially reconcile the Church with the world as it had become after 1789 [*i.e.*, after the French Revolution].”<sup>1</sup>

To reconcile with the world, Pope Paul VI stated that:

[A] wave of affection and admiration flowed from the council over the modern world of humanity. ... [M]essages of trust issued from the council to the

present-day world. The modern world's values were not only respected but honored ....

Address of Pope Paul VI, December 7, 1965.

The “new” SSPX now also seeks to make peace with the world and with the conciliar church. As *Catholic Candle* has shown repeatedly, in many articles quoting the (new) SSPX and citing back to SSPX sources,<sup>2</sup> the “new” SSPX tries hard to fit in with the world and with the conciliar church. The following tiny, partial list (gleaned from *Catholic Candle's* long article list) is merely illustrative:

- Bishop Fellay said in 2009 that his excommunication causes him “much suffering”.<sup>3</sup> By contrast, Archbishop Lefebvre declared it was “a matter of indifference” to him if the conciliar church excommunicated him.<sup>4</sup> In 1988, the “old” SSPX’s major superiors *asked* Rome to excommunicate them in solidarity with their bishops.<sup>5</sup> The “old” SSPX did not care about fitting in with the conciliar church, as Bishop Fellay does.
- The “old” SSPX used to teach that women wearing trousers is a sin of immodesty.<sup>6</sup> The “new” SSPX now says it is fine for its women followers to wear trousers, if women who live around them wear trousers. *Id.* This helps these women followers to look like and be part of the world.
- The “new” SSPX now praises the holiness of the post-conciliar popes<sup>7</sup> and overlooks how destructive they were, preparing the way for the N-SSPX to have the same “heroes” as the conciliar world.
- The “new” SSPX adopts conciliar lingo (*e.g.*, “parish” is now “community”)<sup>8</sup> so that the N-SSPX will be using the same language as the conciliar world.
- The “new” SSPX joins with the secular and conciliar media obsessed with the *physical* violence of Muslim extremists, rather than the more important *spiritual* harm done to souls by the (false) Muslim religion.<sup>9</sup> This conditions N-SSPX followers to share a common focus with the world.
- The “new” SSPX promotes and has joined with the so-called “conservative” wing of conciliar revolutionaries.<sup>10</sup> The “new” SSPX usually remains silent on new conciliar pronouncements of errors except to quote or parrot the “concern” of those “conservative” revolutionaries on the “seriousness” of such issues and the possibility of “confusion” and “misunderstanding”.<sup>11</sup> This aligns the N-SSPX on the “side” of the so-called “conservative” wing of the conciliar church.

- The “new” SSPX now watches and promotes movies, because to abstain from them would be much different from the world.<sup>12</sup>
- The “new” SSPX now permits girls’ school uniforms to be miniskirts (inches above the knee), because the world and conciliar church are lax and immodest.<sup>13</sup> The SSPX’s (previous) traditional standards of modesty are an obstacle to its followers looking like everyone else.

The “new” SSPX has now given us yet another example of its attempts to fit in with the world and with the conciliar church. In the promotional video for the “new” SSPX’s St. Vincent’s Academy in Kansas City, Missouri, the priest-principal assures the viewer that the *SSPX school is not different* from other schools. These are his words:

*Our school is very much like other schools and we use a very similar curriculum and we have a very similar structure to the day, hopefully more discipline than you might find in the run of the mill [school].*<sup>14</sup>

This video contains lots of smiling children raising their hands or kicking a ball, and a guitar-strumming sister. The video mentions “faith”, small class sizes, giving the students “vision”, and preparing the students to be Catholic adults.

But the video never mentions modernism, liberalism, Tradition, the conciliar church, modesty, Christ the King, Vatican II (or its errors), the crisis in the Church, or compromise (or avoiding compromise).

Let us pray for the SSPX which had been the *salt of the earth* but now has lost its savor, trying to fit in with the world and with the conciliar church.

- 
1. *Les Principes de la Theologie Catholique - Esquisse et Materiaux*, Paris: Tequi, 1982, p.427.
  2. Here is the web folder for many proofs quoting the SSPX and citing its own publications: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/sspx.html>

3. <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/tissier-defends-agreement-rome.html>
4. *Biography of Archbishop Lefebvre*, by Bishop Tissier, p. 547.
5. <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/spx-complete-reversal-1988.html>
6. <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/pflugger-culture-women-trousers.html>
7. <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/bouchacourt-promoted-superior-france.html>
8. <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/spx-conciliar-lingo-community.html>
9. <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/spx-chief-duty-islam.html>
10. <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/spx-more-conciliar-books.html>
11. <http://spx.org/en/news-events/news/bp-schneider-amoris-laetitia-creates-confusion-15431>
12. <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/spx-third-order-weakens.html>
13. <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/priests/spx-continues-moral-decline-2.html>
14. <http://spx.org/en/media/video/st-vincent-de-paul-academy-kansas-city-mo-4803>

## **The Resistance Needs a Good Leader as the Catholic Church Needs a Good Pope**

Every religious community should have a leader for organization and to give a sense of direction and permanence. It's possible God has already selected a leader for the Resistance, but that individual refuses to step forward out of a false sense of humility or fear of a firestorm of slander from Menzingen.

That said, there are practical reasons for having a leader. How can membership in the Resistance be expected to increase more rapidly with so much uncertainty about the Mass schedule, or an assured priestly visit for the Last Sacraments, *etc.*? Better organization will make much better use of Resistance priests' time, with greater soul-saving results.

I understand why there are not even more priests leaving the N-SSPX for the Resistance. The priests have no idea how the majority of their fellow priests feel about liberalism permeating the N-SSPX. Instinctively they know they should trust no one and keep their mouths shut.

The iron fist of Menzinger is over each of their heads to see that they toe the (new liberal) line: Accept the Modernism and don't you dare say one word against the coming recognition from Modernist Rome. SSPX priests confirm this fact. Based on that, it's likely that a priest with relatives in the Resistance better not talk to them either. Or even dare to preach the truth if it's against the current liberalism of the N-SSPX leaders. It's Bishop Fellay's way or "the highway." If the priests were free to speak their minds, I don't believe there would be a pending deal with the corrupt Rome of Pope Francis, and the new Society could avoid mass defections of priests and laymen.

I believe each priory has a "Monitor" to ensure all the priests there have their minds "right" concerning the coming deal with Modernist Rome.

It's possible that priests willing to join the Resistance may believe that without a confirmed leader, the permanence and stability of the Resistance is in question. This could also be a problem for laymen. Laymen may be depending on their pastor too much, feeling that if the pastor stays no matter what, then their Faith is safe if they remain. Big mistake!

A reminder to pastors: By your willingness to accept creeping liberalism, you are responsible for the weak-willed laymen's salvation in your parish. Don't forget that you are always setting an example and always will have dependent parishioners.

Archbishop Lefebvre had a more difficult decision to stand up for Tradition against the majority of liberal church leaders, and start the Society of St. Pius X. He was all but alone taking on this uphill struggle. Today, joining the Resistance is just a continuation of Archbishop Lefebvre's fight started 50 years ago.

Most laymen do not have the fortitude to follow their conscience. They need a leader to show the way and help them feel comfortable with this momentous decision.

Priests and laymen in the Resistance are not, by nature, followers. They see a problem and move to solve it. But a priest willing and able to take the next step and lead this movement is a question each must ask himself. They need to reinforce the certainty in their minds that **God will provide** for sure.

God *will* provide a leader for the Resistance when we deserve one. However, we must be humble and must persevere in prayer and patience. We must trust in Divine Providence.

Being the leader in today's Resistance is like Archbishop Lefebvre leading a Resistance after the Second Vatican Council in the 70s. Members of the Resistance are praying and waiting for a priest or bishop to accept God's call.

## **Bishop Williamson's Latest Valtorta Quote Shows Why the Church Condemned Valtorta's False "Visions"**

In his September 3, 2016 Eleison Comments (#477), Bishop Williamson gives a long quote which he asserts to be Our Lord's words, but he did not identify where he got the quote. Here is an excerpt from this long quote (with emphasis added to show the four parts which we discuss below):

The human eye cannot stare at the sun, whereas it has no difficulty in gazing upon the moon. The spiritual eye of the human soul cannot behold the perfection of God as it is in itself, but it can look upon the perfection of Mary. Mary is like the moon with regard to the sun. By its light she is lit up, and that light is what she reflects upon yourselves, but she softens that light in a kind of *spiritual mist* by which it becomes bearable to behold for your limited nature. That is why *for centuries* it is her that I have been putting forward as a model for all of you that I wish to have as brothers, precisely as children of Mary, like myself. ...

And then she is for ever [sic] your Mother. And she has all forms of the Mother's kindness, making excuses and interceding for you and patiently leading you on. Great is Mary's joy when she can say to a soul that loves her, "Love my Son." Great is my own joy when I can say to a soul that loves me, "Love my Mother." And greatest of all is our *double joy when we see either a soul at my feet leaving me to go to my Mother, or one of you held in my Mother's arms leaving her to come to me.* Because the Mother is jubilant when she can give to her Son more souls enamored of her, and the Son is jubilant when he sees more souls loving his Mother. For *when it comes to our glory neither of us seeks to overcome the other, the glory of each of us being complete in the glory of the other.*

Bishop Williamson does not tell the reader that the quote is from Maria Valtorta,<sup>1</sup> the false visionary whose "visions" were condemned before Vatican II by the Holy Office under the great anti-liberal Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani, who is best known for his opposition to the new mass.

(Maria Valtorta's sensual, heretical and smutty work is further analyzed here: <http://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/false-visions-maria-valtorta.html>).

By hiding the fact that this is a Valtorta quote, Bishop Williamson tries to deceive you in the same manner in which someone might try to deceive unwary Catholics with a Martin Luther quote by not revealing that it comes from him.

The Valtorta quote (above) has four errors:

1. It has the supposed "Lord" saying "He" is glad when people leave "Him" to go to "His" mother. That is not Catholic Marian devotion!
2. It treats Christ's glory as comparable to His Mother's glory, whereas His Glory is infinite and entirely incommensurable to the glory of any creature, including His Mother;
3. The reference to Our Lady causing a "mist" is an assertion that Our Lady makes it difficult to understand Our Lord; and
4. It treats devotion to Our Lady as relatively new (only "centuries" old, as the Protestants also assert) and therefore implying that this devotion is not 20 centuries old and going back to the beginning of the Church. This also implies that devotion to Our Lady is not a genuine teaching of the Catholic Church (as explained below).

**1. It is false that Our Lord would ever want anyone to leave Him for any reason.**

The (false) Valtorta vision has the supposed "Lord" saying:

[G]reatest of all is our double joy when we see either a soul at my feet **leaving me** to go to my Mother ...

(Emphasis added.)

This statement is wrong for two reasons:

- a. Any Catholic with even the most basic understanding of the spiritual life knows that the truth is the opposite. Our (real) Lord seeks to draw us to Himself. As He told us: “And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all things to Myself.” St. John, 12:32.

So Our (real) Lord would never have joy because someone *left* Him to go anywhere, for any reason.

- b. *Going to Our Lady is not leaving Our Lord!* Valtorta’s false “Lord” is not describing true Catholic Marian devotion but rather the common Protestants’ caricature of devotion to Mary.

- i. Protestants *agree* with Valtorta’s principle that devotion to Mary causes a person to leave Christ.<sup>2</sup> But from this false principle, the Protestants and Valtorta draw opposite conclusions.<sup>3</sup> The Protestants conclude we should not have devotion to Mary. Valtorta draws the opposite conclusion: her (false) “Lord” says it is a good to be devoted to Our Lady because the (supposed) “Lord” has joy when people leave “Him” to go to her.

- ii. *True Catholic Marian devotion never, ever causes us to leave Christ*, as Valtorta wrongly asserts. Rather, Marian devotion is the surest and shortest path to get *to* Christ. *True Devotion to Mary*, St. Louis Marie, part I, ¶55.

Pope St. Pius X teaches the same true Marian devotion by declaring that Our Lady is the *Neck of the Mystical Body of Christ* because she is the way for Catholics (who are members of this Mystical Body) to go to the Head of the Mystical Body, Who is Christ.<sup>4</sup> Thus, we must never leave Christ but must take the surest and shortest path *to* Christ: *viz.*, Our Lady.

## **2. Valtorta falsely portrays Christ's infinite glory as finite and completed by a creature.**

Valtorta's false vision has the supposed "Lord" saying (about "His" glory and "His" mother's):

[W]hen it comes to our glory neither of us seeks to overcome the other, the glory of each of us being complete in the glory of the other ....

This is false! Our Lord Jesus Christ is God. His glory is and has always been infinite and complete. St. John 1:14. Creatures do not add anything to Him or to His glory. If we take Our Lady's glory as greater than all other creatures combined, her glory is nonetheless finite and *cannot* be compared to her Divine Son's glory because the infinite cannot be measured by the finite and is not commensurate with it or completed by it.

## **3. Valtorta falsely portrays Our Lady as making a "mist" which makes it difficult to understand Our Lord.**

Valtorta says that Our Lady creates a "spiritual mist" through which we see Our Lord. Leaving aside the literal definitions of "mist" (which refer to water droplets), the first metaphorical definition is "something that makes understanding difficult". <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/mist> So Valtorta has the false "Lord" saying that Our Lady makes it difficult to understand the "Lord".

This is false and is the opposite of the truth! True Catholic Marian devotion teaches that Our Lady is the surest and shortest path to understanding and imitating her Son. *True Devotion to Mary*, St. Louis Marie, part IV, ¶165.<sup>5</sup>

## **4. Valtorta falsely portrays devotion to Our Lady as relatively new (only "centuries" old) and therefore (impliedly) not from the beginning of the Church 20 centuries ago.**

Valtorta's supposed "Lord" says that "He" gave us "His Mother" as a model "for centuries". The truth is that the *real* Lord gave His *real* Mother to us as a model for the last two thousand years. In this way, Valtorta supports the Protestant error that devotion to Our Lady was a "new" teaching not present in the early Church.

Our (real) Lord gave us Mary as our model and as our Mother, beginning while He was on earth. For example:

- He gave us His Mother to be our Mother, when He was dying on the Cross. St. John, 19:27.
- He told us her true perfection and value as a model was because, better than anyone else, she was a model of how to “hear the Word of God and keep it”. St. Luke, 11:28.

The apostles and early Fathers of the Church showed us and instructed us how to be devoted to Our Lady. St. Luke painted her portrait. St. John tenderly cared for her. The Fathers all fostered great devotion to Our Lady beginning at the earliest times of the Church. *See, e.g.,* St. Germanus’ sermon for the Feast of the Assumption, concerning the devotion of the apostles for Our Lady; *see also*, all of the praise and devotion of the early Fathers quoted in *The Glories of Mary*, by St. Alphonsus de Liguori, London, 1852 edition, p.232 *et seq.*

Beginning with Our Lord’s own words and example, continuing with his apostles and their successors, the Church has been giving us the example of great devotion to Our Lady for almost 20 centuries. Valtorta’s (false) “Lord” minimizes the truth that the real Lord has been instilling in us devotion to His Mother for almost 20 centuries (since His Life on earth).

In fact, any teaching would not be genuine and Catholic if it did not come from Christ and His apostles, handed down through their successors. See the next article, showing that doctrines not handed down and taught during the *whole* history of the Church (but which have merely been taught “for centuries”) are heresies and are not Catholic teaching (such as is genuine devotion to Our Lady).

Plainly, this Valtorta quote (given above) shows once again why the Church condemned this false visionary’s writings.

### **Bishop Williamson Cavalierly Disregards the Church’s Condemnation of Valtorta.**

The Catholic Church wisely maintained an *Index of Forbidden Books*, listing evil books which Catholics were not permitted to read.

The Church must prohibit bad books because our fallen human nature overconfidently presumes we can read any poisonous book, see the errors, and not be harmed by them.

Bishop Williamson's folly is a perfect example of why the Catholic Church forbade the reading of bad books such as this one. In May, 2016, Bishop Williamson excused his own reading of Valtorta's (condemned) so-called *Poem of the Man-God*, as follows:

The Poem of the Man-God runs into tremendous opposition. I think it's the devil, quite honestly. And I think the devil was in the Holy Office at that point in time. It says that the story is romanced, that's one thing that the Holy Office says. *I don't find that the case.*

<https://youtu.be/N4JfHj8G6Qk?t=43m> (emphasis added).

The great anti-liberal Cardinal Ottaviani's Holy Office condemned Valtorta's false "visions". Bishop Williamson places his personal judgment above the Church's judgment and simply *disagrees* (i.e., "I don't find that the case.").

Bishop Williamson's infatuation with Valtorta shows us the wisdom of the Catholic Church's *Index of Forbidden Books*, because it is so easy to be led astray, as Bishop Williamson has been led astray.

Such folly shows the wisdom of St. Pius X, who tried to warn rashly self-confident souls by *condemning* the following liberal proposition:

*They are free from blame who treat lightly the condemnations passed by the Sacred Congregation of the Index or by the Roman Congregations.*

Condemned proposition No. 8, *Lamentabili Sane*, Pope St. Pius X, 1907.

Bishop Williamson drinks Valtorta's poison, oblivious to his peril. Let us pray for him. He has done much good in the past and could still do much good in the future.

Let us also pray for Bishop Williamson's followers, who are deserters from the army of Christ the King by their silence and approval of Bishop Williamson's liberal words and writings. They don't realize how much they harm souls.

- 
1. <https://www.scribd.com/doc/97408297/Divine-Dictations-to-Maria-Valtorta-1943-Notebooks>
  2. Here is a typical Protestant (heretical) source of the error that going to Mary causes us to leave Our Lord. <http://theaquilareport.com/why-we-dont-pray-to-mary-or-any-other-saint-in-heaven/>
  3. Just as Valtorta and the Protestants share the same false principle but draw opposite false conclusions, similarly the sedevacantists and conciliarists share the same false principle that we must obey whatever a pope says. From this false principle, the sedevacantists conclude that Pope Francis cannot be the pope (otherwise we would have to do whatever he tells us) and the conciliarists conclude the opposite, *viz.*, that we must follow Pope Francis in whatever he tells us.
  4. Pope Pius X's Encyclical on the Immaculate Conception, *Ad diem illum laetissimum*
  5. The dictionary gives one other metaphorical definition: "something that obscures understanding". For this definition, Webster's gives the example of the "mists of antiquity". Using this definition also shows that Valtorta falsifies Marian devotion in a similar way.

**Catholic Candle note:** *Sedevacantism is wrong and Catholic Candle is not sedevacantist. In fact, we published a nine-part series setting out the errors of sedevacantism (and also why it is wrong to believe that former Pope Benedict XVI continues to be pope). <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/against-sedevacantism.html>*

*A reader would be mistaken to believe that the article below gives any support to sedevacantism. This article simply shows that Vatican II's teachings, because they are new, cannot be Catholic and must be rejected. In this way, Vatican II's teachings are like any other erroneous teachings of a pope or bishops. See, e.g., Pope John XXII's denial (in the 14th century) of a doctrine that the Church has always taught infallibly (although this denial did not prevent him from being pope). <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/against-sedevacantism.html#section-9>*

# New Doctrines are not Catholic. They are Heresy.

The First Vatican Council infallibly teaches that new teachings are not the proper subject matter for the guidance of the Holy Ghost:

For the Holy Ghost was promised to the successors of Peter *not so that they might, by His revelation, make known some new doctrine*, but that, by His assistance, they might **religiously guard and faithfully expound the revelation or Deposit of Faith transmitted by the Apostles.**

Vatican I, *Pastor Aeternus*, Sess. 4, ch.4, #6 (emphasis added).

The *Council of Trent Catechism* teaches:

[The Catholic Church's] doctrines are **neither novel nor of recent origin**, but were delivered, of old, by the Apostles, and disseminated throughout the world. Hence, **no one can, for a moment, doubt that the impious opinions which heresy invents, opposed, as they are, to the doctrines taught by the Church from the days of the Apostles to the present time, are very different from the faith of the true Church.**

*Council of Trent Catechism*, under *Creed: Apostolicity* (emphasis added).

*New* doctrines are so foreign to Catholicism that St. Thomas Aquinas defines heretics as follows: “A heretic is someone who devises or follows false or *new* opinions.” *Summa Theologica*, IIa IIae, Q.11, a.1 *Sed contra* (emphasis added). Notice St. Thomas does not say “false *and* new opinions”. The newness of a doctrine is already sufficient reason to reject it.

The Second Council of Nicea, in 787 AD, condemned doctrinal innovators and rejected all innovations, with these words:

[W]e declare that **we defend free from any innovations** all the written and unwritten ecclesiastical traditions that have been entrusted to us. ... Therefore, **all those who ... devise innovations** or who spurn anything entrusted to the Church ..., **we order that they be suspended** if they are bishops or clerics, and **excommunicated** if they are monks or lay people.

Emphasis added.

Pope St. Pius X describes modernists in terms of their break with tradition and their embrace of novel doctrines:

[T]hey pervert the eternal concept of truth and the true meaning of religion; in introducing a new system in which “they are seen to be under the sway of a blind and unchecked **passion for novelty**, thinking not at all of finding some solid foundation of truth, but despising the Holy and Apostolic Traditions.”

Pope St. Pius X, *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, ¶13, quoting from the encyclical *Singulari nos* of Pope Gregory XVI, June 25, 1834 (emphasis added).

### Summary

It is clear that the Holy Ghost is not promised as a guide for the teaching of new doctrines. Further, the Catholic Church has always taught that Her doctrines are not new. Rather, the Catholic Church condemns new doctrines and considers them heresy.

### **As Admitted by the Conciliar Revolutionaries, Vatican II’s Teachings Are New, Which shows that Those Teachings are False.**

Having seen above that the Catholic Church rejects new doctrines and certainly does not teach them infallibly, we next look at whether Vatican II’s teachings are new. If they are, then they cannot be infallible and must be rejected. Below, we set forth the testimony of the hierarchy that the teachings of Vatican II are new. (This is merely one “level” of proof among many, showing that we must reject the teachings of Vatican II.)

#### **The testimony of Pope John Paul II:**

[W]hat constitutes the **substantial “novelty” of the Second Vatican Council**, in line with the legislative tradition of the Church, especially in regard to ecclesiology, constitutes likewise the “novelty” of the new Code [of canon law].

Among the elements which characterize the true and genuine image of the Church, we should emphasize especially the following: the doctrine in which

the Church is presented as the People of God (*cf. Lumen Gentium*, no. 2), and authority as a service (*cf. ibid.*, no. 3); the doctrine in which the Church is seen as a “communion”, and which, therefore, determines the relations which should exist between the particular Churches and the universal Church, and between collegiality and the primacy; the doctrine, moreover, according to which all the members of the People of God, in the way suited to each of them, participate in the threefold office of Christ: priestly, prophetic and kingly. With this teaching there is also linked that which concerns the duties and rights of the faithful, and particularly of the laity; and finally, the Church's commitment to ecumenism. ...

[T]he Second Vatican Council has ... elements both old and new, and *the new consists precisely in the elements which we have enumerated* ....

Pope John Paul II, *Sacrae Disciplinae Leges*, January 25, 1983 (emphasis added).

As quoted above, Pope John Paul II specifically identified key doctrines of Vatican II as novelties. Among the chief novel teachings of Vatican II (and which are contained in the 1983 code of canon law), he lists: “the Church, the universal sacrament of salvation [meaning everyone goes to heaven] is shown to be the People of God and its hierarchical constitution to be founded on the College of Bishops together with its head”. Pope John Paul II, *Sacrae Disciplinae Leges*, January 25, 1983.

We have other warnings that the conciliar doctrines are novelties, (for which the Holy Ghost was not promised). Pope John Paul II admitted the council's novelties in these words:

Indeed, the extent and depth of the teaching of the Second Vatican Council call for a renewed commitment to deeper study in order to reveal clearly the Council's continuity with Tradition, especially in points of **doctrine** which, **perhaps because they are new**, have not yet been well understood by some sections of the Church.

*Ecclesia Dei*, (1988), ¶5b.

The pope is calling for deeper study because 23 years after the council, he acknowledges that Vatican II's continuity with Sacred Tradition is still not shown (nor can it be)!

## The testimony of Pope Benedict XVI:

In the first year of his pontificate, Pope Benedict XVI said:

[W]ith the Second Vatican Council, the time came when broad **new thinking** was required.

December 22, 2005 Christmas address (emphasis added).

Before he became pope, Cardinal Ratzinger taught:

If it is desirable to offer a diagnosis of the text [of the Vatican II document, *Gaudium et Spes*] as a whole, we might say that (in conjunction with the texts on religious liberty and world religions) it is a revision of the Syllabus of Pius IX, a kind of **countersyllabus**. ... Let us be content to say that the text serves as a **countersyllabus** and, as such, represents, on the part of the Church, an attempt at an official reconciliation with the new era inaugurated in 1789 [by the Masonic French Revolution].

*Principles of Catholic Theology: Building Stones for a Fundamental Theology*, translator, Sr. Mary Frances McCarthy (San Francisco: Ignatius Press 1987), pp. 381-382; French edition: *Les Principes de la Theologie Catholique - Esquisse et Materiaux*, Paris: Tequi, 1982, pp. 426-427 (emphasis added; bracketed words added; parenthetical words are in the original).

Note: Obviously, whatever is the opposite (that is, the “countersyllabus”) of the Catholic Church’s prior teaching, must be a novel teaching which the Church did not previously teach. Yet this is how Pope Benedict XVI described some of the main teachings of Vatican II! Thus, clearly, Vatican II’s teachings contain novelties (which are therefore false).

## The testimony of Pope Paul VI:

The *new* position adopted by the Church with regard to the realities of this earth is henceforth well known by everyone .... [T]he Church agrees to recognize the *new* principle to be put into practice .... [T]he Church agrees to recognize the world as ‘self-sufficient’; she does not seek to make the world an instrument for her religious ends ....

August 24, 1969 *Declaration of Pope Paul VI, L'Osservatore Romano*; (emphasis added).

Further, Pope Paul VI also referred to the “newness” of the doctrine of the Second Vatican Council, in a general audience on January 12, 1966. See, [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/paul\\_vi/audiences/1966/documents/hf\\_p-vi\\_aud\\_19660112\\_it.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/audiences/1966/documents/hf_p-vi_aud_19660112_it.html)

### Statements Made by other Members of the Hierarchy

Other members of the hierarchy have also made clear statements concerning the novelty and rupture of the teachings of Vatican II.

Near the close of the council, Cardinal Congar stated:

What is *new* in this teaching [regarding religious liberty] in relation to the doctrine of Leo XIII and even of Pius XII, although the movement was already beginning to make itself felt, is the determination of the basis peculiar to this liberty, which is sought not in the objective truth of moral or religious good, but in the ontological quality of the human person.

Congar, in the Bulletin *Etudes et Documents* of June 15, 1965, as quoted in *I Accuse the Council*, Archbishop Lefebvre, p. 27, Angelus Press, 2009 (emphasis added; bracketed words added).

Yves Cardinal Congar was made a Cardinal by Pope John Paul II in recognition for Cardinal Congar’s lifelong dedication to the conciliar revolution. Cardinal Congar likened Vatican II to the triumph of the communists in Russia, calling Vatican II the “October Revolution” in the Church. Yves Congar, *The Council Day by Day: Second Session* p. 215, (1964).

By this parallel, Cardinal Congar is telling us that Vatican II was an overthrow of the established order in the Catholic Church. Note that, by making this particular comparison, Cardinal Congar saw fit to compare Vatican II to the triumph of the anti-God communists in Russia!

Cardinal Suenens compared Vatican II to a different anti-God revolution. He made the same parallel as Cardinal Ratzinger did (quoted above), comparing Vatican II to the anti-God, Masonic French Revolution, saying that Vatican II was the “1789” in the Church. Quoted in the *Catechism of the Crisis in the Church*, Pt., 5, by Fr. M. Gaudron, SSPX, posted here: [www.angelusonline.org/index.php?section=articles&subsection=show\\_article&article\\_id=2640](http://www.angelusonline.org/index.php?section=articles&subsection=show_article&article_id=2640).

In all three of the cardinals' comparisons of Vatican II with a communist or Masonic revolution, it is clear that they are stating that Vatican II's teaching is revolutionary, and thus it is new and false.

### **Conclusion Regarding the Non-Infallibility (and Falsity) of Vatican II's Teachings based on their Newness (Novelty)**

We have seen that the Holy Ghost is not promised for the teaching of new doctrines. Further, the Catholic Church has always taught that Her doctrines are not new and cannot change. Rather, the Catholic Church condemns new doctrines and considers them heresy.

We have also seen that Pope Benedict XVI, Pope John Paul II and Pope Paul VI (as well as some cardinals), have all stated that Vatican II's doctrines are new. Therefore, Vatican II's teachings cannot be infallible (and further, they must be rejected because they are new and heretical).