

# The Hidden Schism

By

Fr. Albers Ph. B.

# THE HIDDEN SCHISM

By  
F. ALBERS, Ph.B.

"One of the primary obligations assigned by Christ to the office divinely committed to Us of feeding the Lord's flock is that of guarding with the greatest vigilance the deposit of the Faith delivered to the Saints, rejecting the profane novelties of words and the gainsaying knowledge galsely so called.

There has never been a time when this watchfulness of the supreme Pastor was not necessary to the Catholic body; for, owing to the efforts of the enemy of the human race, there have never been lacking "men speaking perverse things" (Acts xx,30), "vain talkers and seducers" (Tit.i,10), "erring and driving into error" (2 Tim.iii,13). It must however been confessed that these latter days have witnessed a notable increase in the number of the enemies of the Cross of Christ, who, by arts entirely new and full of deceit, are striving to destroy the vital energy of the Church, and as far as in them lies, utterly to subvert the very Kingdom of Christ.....

That We should act without delay in this matter is made imperative especially by the fact that the partisans of error are to be sought not only among the Church's open enemies; but, what is to be most dreaded and deplored, in Her very bosom, and are the more mischievous the less they keep in the open. We allude, Venerable Bretheren, to many who belong to the catholic laity, and, what is much more sad, to the ranks of the Priesthood itself, who, animated by a false zeal for the Church, lacking the solid safeguards of philosophy and theology, nay more, thoroughly imbued with the poisonous doctrines taught by the enemies of the Church, and lost to all sense of modesty, put themselves forward as reformers of the Church; and, forming more boldly into line of attack, assail all that is most sacred in the work of Christ, not sparing even the Person of the Divine Redeemer, Whom, with sacrilegious audacity, they degrade to the condition of a simple and ordinary man.

Although they express astonishment that We should number them amongst the enemies of the Church, no one will be reasonably surprised that We should do so, if, leaving out of account the internal disposition of the soul, of which God alone is the Judge, one considers their tenets, their manner of speech and their action. Nor indeed would he be wrong in regarding them AS THE MOST PERNICIOUS OF ALL THE ADVERSARIES OF THE CHURCH. For, as We have said, they put into operation their designs for Her undoing, not from without, BUT FROM WITHIN. Hence the danger is present almost in the very veins and heart of the Church, whose injury is the more certain from the very fact THAT THEIR KNOWLEDGE OF HER IS MORE INTIMATE.

Moreover, they lay the axe not to the branches and shoots, but to the very root, that is, to the Faith and its deepest fibres. And once having struck at this root of immortality, they proceed to diffuse poison through the whole tree, so that there is no part of Catholic Truth which they leave untouched, none that they do not strive to corrupt. Further, none is more skilful, none more astute than they, in the employment of a thousand noxious devices; for they play the double part of rationalist and catholic, AND THIS SO CRAFTILY, that they easily lead the unwary into error; and as audacity is their chief characteristic, there is no conclusion from which they shrink or which they do not thrust forward with pertinacity and assurance.....

It is one of the cleverest devices of the Modernists (as they are commonly and rightly called) to present their doctrines without order and systematic arrangement, IN A SCATTERED AND DISJOINTED MANNER, so as to make it appear as if their minds were in doubt or hesitation, whereas in reality THEY ARE QUITE FIXED AND STEADFAST. For this reason, it will be of advantage, Venerable Bretheren, to bring their teachings together here into one group, and to point out their interconnection, and thus to pass to an examination OF THE SOURCES OF THE ERRORS and to prescribe remedies for averting the evil results.....

Beginning of the Encyclical Letter "PASCENDI DOMINICI GREGIS" on the

Doctrines of the Modernists,

by

His Holyness, St. Pope PIUS X, 1907.

by

F. ALBERS, PH.B.

### INTRODUCTION.

In a previous essay entitled: "TEILHARD DE CHARDIN AND THE DUTCH CATECHISM", published by the International Catholic Priests Association in 1974, I portrayed in great detail what many consider the central problem in the Catholic Church today: the dissemination of Modernism with its cockle of heresy through the widespread acceptance of the Teilhard de Chardin interpretations of Vatican II to the detriment, as His Holyness Pope St. Pius X predicted, to the Catholic Faith of millions: laymen, Priests, Bishops.

Such an article could be viewed as having started 'somewhere in the middle' of a very complex, constantly developing process. It is the purpose of this second article:

1. To look BACK from this somewhat central position to the root-causes of this present-day situation, to study the 'how' and 'why' of this development,
2. To look AHEAD and study its fatal, inevitable consequences; consequences which have already come to pass and can be studied from authentic documentations, and the ones still to come as logical conclusions.

It is good, in this context, to be consoled by the parting words of Our Divine Saviour: "I will not relinquish you like orphans". We CAN know. We ARE in a position to understand. We MUST foresee. It is His Will. It is the will of His Vicar as clearly appears from his quoted words.

From the above the present paper divides naturally into two parts. The first part will consist of two chapters:

- (a) a study of the long preparation towards the Teilhard de Chardin brand of Modernism, and
- (b) an even more important study of the careful preparation towards its acceptance.

These two aspects are NOT the same and must not be confused, as will be shown.

The second part too will consist of two chapters:

- (c) a study of the consequences of the acceptance of the Teilhard doctrine as it affected a particular diocese: its catechetics, the training of its priests and related topics; and
- (d) a study of what may logically be expected to happen if these disastrous effects are allowed to develop to their inevitable outcomes, given the present situation and taking into account the forces that are working towards a definite end.

To understand all this even better it is necessary not only to look back and to look ahead, but also to branch out sideways and study a parallel situation which is rapidly developing in the secular society of our times. This parallel development will be the subject-matter of a THIRD article, which will enable us to follow more accurately the COMBINED trend of things to their logical conclusions.

I cannot stress enough, as I have done in previous articles, the ABSOLUTE necessity for a Catholic, to understand, to KNOW, what is meant by CATHOLIC FAITH. In order to have a deep love for this priceless possession, a Catholic must know what it is, and how it is different from any other faith. We just read the warning of Pope St. PIUS X: that the axe is being laid at the very root, that is to the Faith itself, and we will hear Teilhard proclaim that that is his very intention.

+

PART ONE.

THE LONG PREPARATION TOWARDS THE TEILHARD DE CHARDIN  
BRAND OF MODERNISM. (Ch. 1) and

THE CAREFUL PREPARATION TOWARDS ITS ACCEPTANCE. (Ch. 2)

MODERNISM is the general name given to the school of thought, or system, which puts the fundamental truths of the Catholic Faith in jeopardy by its constant effort to subject the whole of Catholic doctrine to the requirements of human thought. Whatever the exponent of this 'human thought' may be at a particular time. In its early days it was RATIONALIST philosophy, (Diderot, d'Alembert, Voltaire), then POSITIVISM, SCIENCE, and finally, in its present-day virulent Teilhard de Chardin form, the whole of Catholic Dogma must be subjected to the requirements of that pseudo-science: EVOLUTION. The immediate aim of modernism is the total destruction and collapse of the Catholic Faith. Its ultimate aim is the domination of the Catholic Church by the Prince of Darkness. Aspects which make modernism more understandable are NATURALISM (Rousseau) and HUMANISM.



To give you some idea of what is meant here: Just imagine what would happen to those glorious dogmas of the Catholic Faith as the Divinity of Christ, the perpetual Virginity of Mary, the Divine Maternity of Mary, the Inerrancy of Scripture, if they could only be accepted in so far<sup>as</sup> science with its 'proofs' and 'disproofs' would have the final say in it. What would be left of the most fundamental doctrine of them all: the Blessed Trinity?

Right from the start of this dissertation two things must be clearly borne in mind: -- the absolute impossibility of the Catholic Church ever being overpowered by the forces of darkness, no matter how reduced and almost invisible the Church may become, and

-- the utter possibility of whole sections, even very large sections of catholics losing their catholic faith to modernism AND THUS NO LONGER CONSTITUTING THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, no matter how perplexingly big and well-organised their world-wide body may appear to us.

It must further be recognised that it is one thing to prepare a world-wide system of heresy and quite another thing to have it accepted. The former has received quite a covering in responsible books and publications. The latter is subtle, is the more pernicious (as the Holy Father called it), has not been adequately dealt with, but has caused the wide-spread damage. Adam and Eve were both tempted to the SAME act of disobedience, but they were also subjected to different preparations of ACCEPTANCE. The preparation towards the acceptance of a new faith is just as important as the preparation of the new faith itself.

CHAPTER ONE.

A SHORT HISTORY OF MODERNISM. ITS TRANSITION INTO  
TEILHARD'S SYSTEM.

How far the cancer of Modernism has eaten into the very life of many Catholics becomes immediately apparent to anyone who takes time ~~to~~ to read what Popes and Councils of the Church have said over the last 140 years. An excellent compendium of the history of Modernism and its errors and heresies is contained in a recent book: "The Enemy within the Gate", by Fr. McKee. The book, however good on the description of the Modernism condemned by St. Pope PIUS X, is comparatively silent on the transition, vital to us, to the Modernism of Teilhard which has swept the Church our times.

To give you an idea how far back one has to go to hear a clear echo of the difficulties of our own times, I'll quote the following entry HERDER's Church-Lexicon:

"CLEMENT AUGUST von DROSTE-VISCHERING....became Archbishop of COLOGNE in 1835....His condemnation of writings favouring heretical tendencies and his disavowal OF CERTAIN PROFESSORS OF THEOLOGY INFECTED BY HERESY, aroused the animosity of the government against him.... After an imprisonment of two years, the Archbishop was honourably released. He resigned his position as Archbishop of Cologne and went to ROME where he became an advisor to Pope GREGORY XVI."

It was this Pope who in 1835 condemned the works of one of those German theology professors, one Fr. George Hermes, as heretical for exactly the same reasons: POSITIVISM, as MODERNISM would be condemned more than 70 years later, in 1907, by Pope St. PIUS X. From 1832 onwards the uninterrupted stream of condemnations from the Holy See, gaining in clarity as the infernal intentions of the enemy became more clear, did not leave anyone who valued his Catholic Faith in any doubt as to the dividing line between Science and Revelations.

Most of this is available to any alert catholic, even today, but maybe only a Saint like Pope PIUS X could foresee the unprecedented upheavals in the Church of the 2nd half of the 20th century and the ferocity with which the BREAK with the past would come. For, if most of us are conscious of ONE THING, it is NOT that we have developed from a bad situation before VATICAN II to a worse situation afterwards, but rather, that such an awful lot of people who still seem to be inside the Church, appear to have broken with the past and with Tradition. On the one hand, the devil and his minions GRADUALLY developed the successful (let us call it ) SCHOOL of Modernism, condemned by PASCENDI, into the highly successful system of Modernism of Teilhard, condemned by 'HUMANI GENERIS' of 1950. But next to this gradual development of this new faith something else developed. And it was in this area that at a given instant something gave, something collapsed, and this is what I have called the top-secret, very elusive and subtle preparation to the ACCEPTANCE of the modernistic thought, of the deceit. Many catholics have become modernistic NOT because of intellectual conviction: they would hardly know how to formulate it, but for totally different reasons with which we will occupy ourselves in the 2nd chapter. First: how did the modernism of LOISY and TYRRELL develop into the modernism of TEILHARD? How did it go from a 'school' into a closely knitted 'system'? Let us listen to the ones appointed by God to teach us in these matters.

Here is the opening paragraph with which Pope St.PIUS X starts the body of his famous encyclical PASCENDI, immediately following the quote on p. 2,:



"To proceed in an orderly manner in the somewhat abstruse subject it must first of all be noted that the Modernist sustains and includes within himself a MANIFOLD PERSONALITY: he is a philosopher, a believer, a theologian, an historian, a critic, an apologist, a reformer".

This is a clear description of the various strands of their SCHOOL. In his lengthy encyclical the Holy Father deals with each strand separately in amazing depth.

Now let us briefly listen to the words with which another Pope, Pope PIUS XII, introduces the body of his argument, in his equally famous encyclical "HUMANI GENERIS" of 1950:

"A glance at the world outside the Catholic fold will familiarize us easily enough with the false directions which the thought of the learned often takes. Some (he means i.e. Teilhard here) will contend that THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION as it is called - a theory which has not yet been proved beyond contradiction even in the sphere of natural science - APPLIES TO THE ORIGIN OF ALL THINGS ~~WHATSOEVER~~..... These false evolutionary notions, with their denial of all that is absolute or fixed or abiding in human experience (Tradition) HAVE PAVED THE WAY FOR A NEW PHILOSOPHY OF ERROR".

(The Holy Father then continues to view philosophy, theology, authority from this central point of view: evolution, condemning the aberrations in each caused by these 'false evolutionary notions'.)

So, in the intervening 40 odd years separating these two great encyclicals, what consisted of various strands had now developed into a modernistic SYSTEM: evolution, which system proved to be just as fallacious as the strands from which it was composed and out of which it had grown. It is from this central point of evolution that every thing in catholic dogma, and catholic Bible exegesis, and Catechetics, and Tradition is being viewed and taught by the disobedient sons and daughters of the Church. 'These false evolutionary notions'. Pope St. PIUS X clearly showed that no human system, however sound, can on its own ever be the touchstone of Revelation and Faith. What then about the drift-sand of the theory of evolution, which is in the process of being discarded by an ever widening circle of scientists on pure scientific grounds?

That EVOLUTION was chosen by the enemies of God to become the vehicle of introducing SYSTEMATIC MODERNISM within the catholic Church on a grand scale in order to subvert it more effectively from WITHIN, is borne out by numerous testimonies. -- The very possibility of this happening did not escape clear-sighted men in DARWIN's own lifetime. Prof. SEDGWICK of Cambridge, a good friend of Darwin, read 'Origin of Species' and then wrote to Darwin, Christmas 1859, warning him that, if his evolutionary teachings were accepted, 'humanity would suffer a damage that might brutalize it and sink the human race into a lower state of degradation than any into which it has fallen since it written records...'

The following two quotes are from an interesting book called "DARWIN, BEFORE AND AFTER" by Robert E.D.CLARK, M.A., PH.D.:

"Evolution, in short, gave the doer of evil a respite from his conscience. The most unscrupulous behaviour towards a competitor could now be rationalised. Evil could be called good".

"In time, the theory of evolution permeated human thought in almost every direction. The ultimate result was exactly what Sedgwick had said would happen: brutalisation. The new doctrine very soon began to undermine religion."

Books have been written, too many even to enumerate, how the theory of evolution has inspired Big Business, Education, Prussianism, Communism, Fascism, Religion, (only so-called like the DUTCH CATECHISM, p.10: 'The life in my body comes from

*André de P. 15*

the beasts' and right through the book), Irreligion, Sex philosophy, Abortion, Society. On the last topic, B.G.SANDHURST wrote a book: "HOW HEATHEN IS BRITAIN?" 1948, from which the following passage is quoted in the discussion on Army Officers trainees: "Often one-third of my audiences are so conditioned by the theory of evolution that they cannot believe that they are in any way different from the other animals".

How Scientific is all this? The position in this regard is very well summed up by the following quote from: "THE PREMISES OF EVOLUTIONARY THOUGHT" by R.J.Rushdoony:

"Sigmund FREUD, as an evolutionary scientist, has been a source of embarrassment to his many dedicated followers at one critical point: Freud grounded his evolutionary thinking firmly on the theories of LAMARCK. The inheritance of acquired characteristics is basic to Freud's anthropology, biology, psychology. In the face of extensive criticism Freud 'adhered throughout his life to the Lamarckian belief' (JONES). At this point even his devoted disciple and biographer, Dr. Ernest JONES, criticised Freud as "What one must call an obstinate adherent of this discredited Lamarckism". Freud, however, was resolute. BECAUSE OF HIS HOSTILITY TO RELIGION the doctrine of Evolution was intensely important to Freud, and evolutionary theory provided for no effective mechanism for evolution apart from Lamarck. TO DENY LAMARCK and the inheritance of acquired characteristics was to posit a god-like power somewhere in or behind evolution and to introduce illegitimately an element resembling the SUPERNATURAL..."

Multiply this incident a million times over and over again: the blind acceptance of unscientific wishful thinking against evidence, in order to vent one's spleen against God, Religion, the Supernatural, the Church, and one can appreciate the picture of the Catholic Church, surrounded by scientific hostility as a beleaguered city of God. In order to see this even better, see "THE TWILIGHT OF EVOLUTION" by H. MORRIS, pp. 25 - 26 for 'religious' hostility, and "SCIENTIFIC STUDIES IN SPECIAL CREATION" (LAMMERTS) pp. 338 - 343 for social and educational hostility since all have been drenched with evolutionary theories, "those false evolutionary notions..."

What about erosions caused by evolution within the beleaguered city?

Here, for the sake of space only, we must confine ourselves to the writings of the late PIERRE TEILHARD DE CHARDIN, who, as we will see, deliberately chose to remain within the visible confines of the Catholic Church, the beleaguered city, in order to be better able to subvert Her from within. However, it is absolutely impossible to quote any other modern Modernist who <sup>has</sup> raised his voice against the Church from within, who was not deeply influenced by TEILHARD. Even if they do not follow his absurd system, they have adopted his principles and have all clamoured for recognition of evolution as a legitimate theological principle to explain Bible and Dogma. None of them waited for approval, all disregarded disapproval. Here is an example from the writings of one of those theologians of repute: Fr. Karl RAHNER, S.J.

"In the present state of theology and science it cannot be proved that polygenism conflicts with orthodox teaching on Original Sin. IT WOULD BE BETTER, THEREFORE, IF THE MAGISTERIUM REFRAINED FROM CENSURING POLYGENISM".

In "ORIGINAL SIN IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN SCIENCE", the late Fr. Patrick O'CONNELL B.D. demolishes this preposterous claim (pp 77 - 88).

Returning then to TEILHARD we have reached a critical stage in our dis-



course. Enough is known about his theories, BUT WHAT ABOUT INTENT? Was he simply mistaken or a dupe, or was there more to it? Here we can start to discern a glimmer of the naked face of Satan himself in his twofold preparation. Teilhard was certainly used to introduce a deceitful system into the Church and he knew what he was doing. But was he also used deliberately to have the system ACCEPTED? If the latter is true then Teilhard is just as indispensable as he is inexcusable with regard to the damage done, even if, after the deadly poison has taken effect, many now pretend that they have discarded him as a useless syringe. I am sorry if we only have used the highlights in the history of Modernism in order to come to this position, but the detailed study of what is to follow is imperative if one wants to keep a clear head and untroubled eye in the massive confusion all around us. We will finish this first chapter with an outline of Teilhard's position and use it as an introduction to the second chapter where we study the widespread acceptance of his subversion and the underlying causes.



Teilhard's brand of evolution is best described as a THEISTIC PANTHEISM, WHICH is of course a contradiction in terms and therefore NON-EXISTENT. Do not for one moment think that the disobedient sons and daughters of the Church who poured over his works and propagated them, ever came across a definition as simple as the one I just used. First-class brains have come to this conclusion and we can verify the truth of their findings. But like always in God's Church: in the early stages it was simply a question OF OBEYING THOSE to whom more light and enlightenment was given for the care of the souls entrusted to them. After the initial obedience the Light would then gradually be communicated to all those "who had done God's Will on earth as it was done (and known) in Heaven". But they who had disregarded the strong words of Pope St. PIUS X in 'PASCENDI' and 'LAMENTABILI' and who had accepted the principles of modernism, saw no cause for concern when modernism gradually got dressed up as evolution, and they were stiffened in their hostility to the Magisterium when this 'misunderstood genius' was trying to put some theism into it. That was good enough for them. That it was pantheism either escaped them or they simply did not believe it. Wasn't evolution proved by science? Then it must be full of God if it came from God, ran their arguments. But let us listen a bit more than they did to the man himself:

"My spirit has always been naturally pantheistic. I felt its inborn AND UNCONQUERABLE ASPIRATIONS, but I dare not give them free reign because I could not reconcile them with my faith. But after these experiences and others like them I have found a life-long and unalterable peace. I live in the heart of a single element, the centre of cosmic power." (Hymn of the Universe).

"I am essentially pantheistic in my thinking and pantheist by temperament, and my whole life has been spent in proclaiming that there is a true pantheism of union". (Duggan in TEILHARDISM AND THE FAITH).

Miss HILDA GRAEF in her book "MYSTICS OF OUR TIME" (she places Teilhard among the mystics) relates that he as a child of six had a bar of iron hidden which he used to bring out from time to time to 'adore'. He would hold it up and say:

"GOD. IRON." And that his commentary on this childish habit, 60 years later, was:

"In this instinctive movement which made me truly worship a small piece of metal, there was a strong sense of self-giving...and my spiritual life has been merely A DEVELOPMENT OF THIS."

Fr. NORTH, S.J. and others confirm Miss GRAEF's account of young Teilhard adoring pieces of metal - Fr. LEROY, S.J. mentions a spanner - and adds that his mother

would take the spanner of him and try to substitute devotion to the Sacred Heart in stead. Fr. DUGGAN sums it all up rather well with a quote from Teilhard:

"The divine and created, natural and supernatural are ORGANICALLY all of one piece".

So, whatever his system is going to be, it is obvious that it is based, as far as the Catholic Church is concerned, on a totally unacceptable idea. Well, he calls his system evolution and, while accepting the scientific 'findings', he tried to show that evolution had a within. This was, as we saw, totally rejected by Freud and was to be rejected by all outsiders as we will see. The trouble for Teilhard now is that with his 'within', the system not only did not become catholic or even christian: IT BECAME DOUBLE OBJECTIONABLE.

"Evolution is not just hypotheses or theories: it is a general condition to which all theories, all hypotheses, all systems must bow and which they must satisfy if they are thinkable and true..."

says Teilhard, and then sets out to 'prove' it. That he was not very convincing in this becomes apparent when one is confronted with the following quotation from Prof. SIMPSON of Hartford University, speaking for all evolutionists:

"Teilhard's beliefs as to the course and causes of evolution are NOT scientifically acceptable because they are not based on scientific premises".

Why is this condemnation so remarkable? Not only is Prof. SIMPSON an extreme evolutionist, but he was made by Teilhard as one of the executors of his literary will, and so Simpson would have defended him if he could have done so without loss of his own reputation. Teilhard's brand of evolution did not fool outsiders: IT WAS STRICTLY FOR DISOBEDIENT CATHOLICS. Can this be proved? Can it be shown to be anti-catholic?

Teilhard was well aware that his groping for a solution satisfactory to him must be within a new system. He was equally well aware of the consequences:

"A collective optimism, realistic and courageous, must definitely replace the pessimism and individualism, whose overgrown notions of sin and personal salvation have gradually burdened AND PERVERTED the christian spirit. Let us then acknowledge the situation honestly: not only the 'Imitation of Christ' but also the GOSPEL ITSELF NEEDS TO UNDERGO THIS CORRECTION, and the whole world will make them undergo it." (1929).

"What increasingly dominates my interest is the effort to establish within myself and to diffuse around me a NEW RELIGION in which the personal God is no longer the great neolithic landowner of times gone by, but the SOUL of the world, as the cultural and religious stage we have reached now demands." (1936).

"I have come to the conclusion that, in order to pay for a drastic valorisation and amorisation of the substance of things, A WHOLE SERIES OF RE-SHAPING OF CERTAIN REPRESENTATIONS OR ATTITUDES, WHICH SEEM TO US DEFINITELY FIXED BY CATHOLIC DOGMA, HAS BECOME NECESSARY, if we sincerely want to Christify evolution. Seen thus, and because of an imeluctable necessity, one could say that a HITHERTO UNKNOWN FORM OF RELIGION is gradually germinating in the heart of modern man in the furrow opened by the idea of EVOLUTION." (1953).

The following is taken from a letter to an ex-priest who had left the Church, and after noticing that the encyclical 'HUMANI GENERIS' was written in condemnation of Teilhard's ideas, wrote him a letter inviting him to join him in his battle to change the Church from without. This is the body of Teilhard's reply:

"Basically I consider - as you do - that the Church reaches a period of mutation or necessary reformation. To be more precise: I consider that the reformation in question (and much more profound a one than that of the 16th century) is no longer a simple matter of institutions and ethics, BUT OF FAITH. Having stated my views I still cannot see any better means

of bringing about what I anticipate than to work towards this reform FROM WITHIN. In the course of the last 50 years I have watched the revitalization of Catholic thought and life taking place around me - in spite of the encyclicals - too closely not to have unbounded confidence in the ability of the old Roman stem to revivify itself. LET US THEN EACH WORK IN OUR SEPARATE SPHERE: ALL UPWARD MOVEMENTS CONVERGE."

To me and many with me, these are the words and intentions of a heretic. This is not poetic licence: these are the systematic actions of a man who knows what he is about: "TO LAY THE AXE AT THE ROOT ITSELF, THAT IS FAITH", as was predicted it would happen by a Saint more than 40 years previously. That the enemies of the Church understood perfectly well what Teilhard was doing here, will come out further on in this article. And just as FREUD needed an unscientific system of evolution to cling to in his antipathy against God and Religion, so many catholics are clinging to teilhardism in their hostility for an 'oldfashioned' Catholic Church and in their hope to change Her to their own liking. For further reading on this matter, see Fr.O'CONNELL, op.cit. pp. 58 - 59.



You can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make him drink. If planning a world-wide, comprehensive and subtle heresy is one thing, then its acceptance needs an entirely different preparation. A heresy does not necessarily recommend itself on its intellectual content. It is absolutely impossible that heresy will ever be embraced in the Supernatural Light of Catholic Faith, which is the Light of God Himself, communicated here on earth to the human mind as a free gift from God to believe all that God has revealed and the Holy Catholic Church proposes to us for our consent as having been revealed by God. We have God's guarantee that neither the Catholic Church nor Holy Scripture will ever propose heresy to us to be believed. Only a mere human faith can accept heresy, but in doing so will darken and eventually extinguish the Supernatural Light of Faith and plunge the mind in darkness. And so it is in darkness of mind only, by the feeble torchlight of reason alone, that Teilhard's system seems to fit the answers. If that is so, then the big question is: "WHO TURNED THE LIGHT OF FAITH OFF?" The answer to that question is being examined in this chapter.

In the speech given by the Grand Master Jacques MITTERAND at the occasion of the General Assembly of the Grand Orient of France, held in PARIS from Sept. 3 - 7, 1962, in which speech French Freemasonry claimed TEILHARD DE CHARDIN as their own, MITTERAND made an overt reference to the 18th Rule of the KABBALA, the 10th century top secret mystical doctrine of a Jewish forerunner of the Freemasons, which states:

"Beware that you do not dish up to the christian dogs their deadly strychnin pill plain, but be sure to wrap it up in a large slice of soft flesh."

Satan wanted desperately the Catholic defenders of the beleaguered City of God to accept Teilhard's NEW RELIGION so that they would lose their Catholic Faith and so become displaced persons in his own concentration camp. He knew that many



- especially among the Clergy - for reasons which we will discuss shortly, had already *pro foro interno*, i.e. in their own private thoughts, placed many secret question marks against not a few doctrines and practices of the Catholic Faith. But to go from private doubts to the wholesale jettisoning of catholic dogma as required by Teilhard for the embrace of evolution, is too much to ask, UNLESS THIS EMBRACE OF THE WORLD AND THE FLESH CAN BE MADE 'HOLY'. And in evolution, no matter how unscientific, this embrace of the world and the flesh is made to appear holy to meet the SOUL of evolution, Teilhard's new 'personal god'.

And so, when VATICAN II, under the direct inspiration from God in order (as is so often the case) TO REVEAL ONCE AGAIN THE SECRET THOUGHTS OF THE MANY, opened a window of compassion on the world, millions of catholics, well prepared by Teilhard's aberrations and deaf to the warnings of the Church, took this as their signal THAT GOD HIMSELF HAD SANCTIONED THIS MAN'S CALL TO THE WORLD, and out they flocked to its embrace. The whole beleaguering, after all, proved to be nothing more than a terrible nightmare: did not both camps meet over this divinely inspired evolution and did they not all share a common faith in this precious evolution? The whole ghastly mistake of the past: TRENT, VATICAN I, PASCENDI, HUMANI GENERIS better be forgotten, the quicker the better. Teilhard's improved christianity, built on his precious evolution was the religion of the future, a christianity, which will allow you to follow your own conscience, to have the pill, abortions, freemasonry, communism: all in name of evolution, an evolution which calls sin nothing more startling than a mistake....

The constant hammering from the intellectual world outside the Catholic Church: that the Church is wrong, that the Church is fighting a desperate rear-guard action against the findings of science and evolution, making educated catholics like CHARLEMORTH more and more embarrassed and ill at ease, has at last had its effect. And the condemnation of this Jesuit-Priest-Scientist-Evolutionist-Poet-Mystic TEILHARD DE CHARDI was just about the last straw. His synthesis embracing all: science, 'dogma', world, theology, god, was precisely what everybody had been looking for. This blue-print of things to come SIMPLY COULDN'T BE WRONG. The people outside were right: there was something seriously wrong with the Church. It badly needed updating. What better chance than interpreting VATICAN II in the light of the teachings of this genius, this second Thomas Aquinas....

But then, after the first exhilaration had died down, something totally unexpected started to happen: slowly first, but unmistakably as time went on: THE VARIOUS CRISES OF IDENTITY AROSE. Priests all of a sudden found themselves in the wrong camp. Surely, on the teachings of this man, celibacy should be optional. Didn't the whole Church go over then to this new religion with its newly found freedom?? Modernistic bishops, Teilhardian religious, free-wheeling catholics: all had the greatest difficulty recognizing their new surroundings. The 'new catechetics' did not seem to fit in or make sense with the old one. Poverty, chastity, obedience all looked so hopelessly outmoded, so incongruous in the embrace of a world in evolution.... And so one could go on and list sign after sign that the global exodus from the Catholic Church has created a vast camp of displaced persons who have lost their identity, their freedom and their faith. They are living in make-shift hovels, without the Sacrifice, without Mary, without the Rosary, but because there are so many of them they are convinced that

they are the Catholic Church and that they have a right to impose their views on the old reactionaries, the not-with-it-people who preferred to stay in their Father's House. But why didn't it work? It ought to have worked! It looked so much like the real thing. There was only one thing wrong with it: the Church had forbidden it. It was a forbidden fruit. But surely....There was a precedence for this. Just as all the misery, all the dreadful sins, all the wars and death in the world came into this world through the ONE SIN of our first parents: ORIGINAL SIN of disobedience, so the rebellion, the apostasy, the confusion, the heresies, the disobedience to the Magisterium, the broken unity, the general paralysis and the crises of identity ALL have their origin IN THE ONE SINGLE ACT: the almost universal acceptance of TEILHARD's OBLITERATION of this first original sin in order to make a breach for his unscientific evolution. And into the breach came every conceivable evil EXCEPT EVOLUTION....

Here then is part of the gloating speech by Grandmaster MITTERAND, not only to an assembly of French Freemasons, but over their heads to the whole world:

"By contrast to us, Freemasons, the Catholics, in name of ecumenism, do not hold fast to their past in order to learn from it; they rather do all they can to disown their Tradition in order to tailor their religion to renewal. Now why should this happen? Well, pay attention to this, that you may learn how all this took its beginning.

16 One day a scientist rose from their ranks, a genuine scientist, PIERRE TEILHARD DE CHARDIN. Maybe without full realisation, he committed LUCIFER's crime, which the Church of Rome has so often accused us Freemasons of perpetrating: he declared that in the phenomenon of hominization or, to use Teilhard's own formula, in the Noosphere, that is the sum-total or mass of collective consciences surrounding the globe like the lowest layer of the atmosphere IT IS MAN AND NOT GOD who ranks first and is the chief architect of this process. When this collective consciousness has reached its apogee, at the Omega-point as Teilhard himself would put it, then we will have produced the new type of man as we wish him to be: FREE IN HIS FLESH, untrammelled in his mind. Teilhard thus put man on the altar and since he adored man he could no longer adore God.

Rome grasped it accurately, and through all the backward powers, concentrated in its bosom IT CONDEMNED TEILHARD and prohibited the publication of his works.

But what has been the use of this condemnation? you will ask me. Did it benefit Rome? Did it not much more benefit Teilhard? Listen carefully: During his life Teilhard could not publish any of his texts. Only after his death became it possible to bring his books out through the Editions du Seuil and Grasset, obviously without the blessing of the Church of Rome. Imagine that we had found ourselves in such a country as Spain where the Church controls everything: neither editions du Seuil nor Grasset would have had a chance of publishing Teilhard de Chardin's works. Ah! There they all are, then, all and each in their successive refusals to acknowledge his works, trying to preserve BY BRUTE FORCE all the powers of the past IN ORDER TO CRUSH THE FUTURE.

And so it is LEFT TO US and to our mission to serve the future. Not satisfied by being - at home and in our temples - the secret republic (i.e. the real power behind the State), WE ARE AT THE SAME TIME AND MUCH MORE THE COUNTER-CHURCH (sic), because we are the men of life, the men of hope, of light, of progress, of intelligence and of reason."

And then Jacques MITTERAND took the blasphemy even further by identifying freemasonry with THE truth, and THE light; The source OF ALL TRUTH AND OF ALL LIGHT..... (DAS ZEICHEN MARIENS, Oct. Nov. Dec. 1971, Vol. 5, Nos. 6, 7, 8.)

So these are the people who have taken Teilhard under their wing, avowing to continue his work while gloating over the fact that, in total disobedience to the Magisterium, his works are being published, blessing themselves that it did not happen in Spain. And apparently approving of Teilhard's mortal sin of disobe-



dience of making a will bequeathing all his property to atheistic executors so that his works posthumously can be published outside the jurisdiction of the Church. Only totally subverted Teilhard de Chardin 'catholics' could clamour to the Holy Father to lift the ban on Freemasonry so that Our Holy Mother the Church, the Spotless Bride of the Lamb of God could 'benefit' from the invasion by this 'counter-church'.

But that is not all: Teilhard was not only in all secrecy a member of the Freemasons himself, he was a member of that ultra-subvertive sect, the Martinists, who for 200 years had worked unceasingly for the day that the christian dogs would take the bait of the whole agglomerate of syncretism, gnostic rosicrucian mumbo-jumbo and pseudo-scientific clap-trap and swallow the deadly strychnin.

The unprecedented scale of the defection to this new church of darkness by so many Priests and laypeople in our days, makes it virtually impossible to suppress the suspicion that, like in the days of the Arian heresy, the bishops collectively are involved, i.e. the bishops as a body, with the good ones the exceptions. What is the truth here? The truth here is that the college of bishops is just as deeply split and divided as the rest of the Church and that they are reaping the thorny harvest of more than 100 year basking in the false sun of liberalism by so many of them. For precedence I refer to an excellent article: "CARDINAL NEWMAN AND THE AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH" by Mgr. FLANAGAN, an APPROACHES' Supplement, which would serve as an introduction. For the contemporary problem we could do worse than listen very carefully to the words of the late Most Rev. William ADRIAN, Bishop of NASHVILLE, Tennessee. This prelate wrote a penetrating article on this very subject, entitled: "HOW DID IT HAPPEN", which started as follows:



"Ever since the Second Vatican Council I have been puzzled to know what caused the sudden outbreak of mass confusion and heartache that is affecting our Catholic people of America today - even to the extent of serious rebellion against church authority and many defections. In all my life I have witnessed nothing, nothing remotely approaching this turmoil that is so deeply affecting all Catholics:- BISHOPS, Priests, Religious and the laity. The UPI calls this the most startling ferment of centuries in the Church."

Even the non-catholic has been taken by surprise. Dr. Martin MARTY, a Lutheran theologian, recently wrote:-

'The Roman Catholic renewal has been beset by fickle theology, simplistic thinking, thoughtlessness and a frequent compulsion to leave the rocking ship. Catholic theologians have been offering experiments as solutions, and tentative steps as the last word. THEY LISTEN NOT TO ALL THE THOUSANDS OF YEARS OF RELIGIOUS WISDOM BEFORE THEM: they talk but they have NOTHING TO SAY....'

But how did so many of our catholic clergy so suddenly get this way? The dramatic story really begins 100 years ago with the summoning of the First Vatican Council by Pope PIUS IX.....

✓ The Bishop then goes on in some detail to show that the Dogma of the Infallibility of the Pope as defined by that Council, was ill-received, at least 'in foro interno' (in their private thoughts and convictions) by many Northern European Bishops. To rationalize their attitude they saw in it a barb of perpetuating Italian dominance over the Church and over the Papacy. And so the whole dispute degenerated into one of political factions and alliances. More at home in politics than in following their Saviour on the Via Dolorosa in search of the lost sheep, these by and large wealthy bishops could afford the luxury of listening to the political arguments of their liberal theologians who introduced them to ways of thinking

completely alien to the Redeemer's Gospel: evolution of Dogma, power sharing through collegiality, de-institutionalizing the powerful 'Church of Rome'. As so often in the Church: the very first nurturing of a doubt in the Wisdom of the Holy Ghost and the harbouring of thoughts 'that God could have ulterior motives' for demanding obedience, even from Bishops (for catholics such a powerful re-enactment of the first temptation in paradise), forced these Bishops to start walking roads which they did not really want to pursue, but from which they no longer could extricate themselves without loss of face with their less scrupulous contemporaries. And so the Light must have gradually dimmed in these leaders of the Faith in Europe and they relied increasingly more heavily on the artificial light of reason, science and social studies to find their way, readily supplied (as bishop ADRIAN tells us) by such 'luminaries' as KUNG, DAVIS, RAHNER, SCHILLE-BEECKX, CONGAR, BAUM and a few others, such as SCHOONENBERG, who wrote the Dutch Catechism and was able to 'sell' it to the Hierarchy. Recognize them all? ALL 'PERITI' at the Second Vatican Council. At the Council the bishops they had introduced to their thinking were at a (dubious) advantage of being articulate in the modern philosophy and theology built on Teilhard's ideas and the need was felt by other bishops to become 'updated'. Through private lectures and crash-courses (IDOC) these periti received an influence far above their worth. Before the Vatican Council, these 'periti' were considered by many as extremists, but National Hierarchies could not now all of a sudden disown them, now that they were so much in demand by other bishops.

As is so often the case: God creates a situation (as the Holy Man SIMEON explained to us in the Temple) 'which reveals (in fact: forces open) the secret thoughts in the hearts of many'. Spurred on by their skilful periti, VATCAN II, which for the Holy Father and the Church in union with him, became a perfectly legitimate means of reviewing the Church's position, became for the liberal bishops on both sides of the Atlantic, the fierce battleground for collegiality. Listen once more to Bishop ADRIAN:-

"THE MAIN ISSUE at the Second Vatican Council was really that of collegiality - or the question of how the bishops, as a body, could somehow rule over the Church, the Pope holding only a primacy of honor, not of jurisdiction independent of the bishops. The liberal bishops knew that, in order to destroy the autocratic power of the Pope and the Curia, they had to stress the idea of rule by the bishops collectively, and thus they could overrule the Pope. Also, such a move would overcome the embarrassing doctrine of Papal Infallibility so inimical to non-catholics."

But the Pope intervened and corrected the false doctrines created by the bishops, which later drew from HANS KUNG the bitter comment: "The Pope has an exaggerated view of his office. The papacy, after all said and done, is a human institution and has no origin in the Gospels". But then Hans Kung has already lost his faith in the Gospel way back. So then what happened?

"These liberal theologians seized on the Council as the means of de-catholicising the Catholic Church while pretending only to de-Romanize it. As the Council developed, some of the originally somnolent American bishops, catching fire from their alert European colleagues, became the able engineers of liberal proposals, going beyond the Europeans in ferocious, vituperative attacks on the Roman Curia. Yet, however brilliant the American periti may have been, they got their ideas from the European Catholic liberal theologians and bishops. These European periti who really imposed their theories upon the Council Fathers WERE THEMSELVES DEEPLY ~~IMBUE~~ IMBUED WITH THE ERRORS OF TELHARDISM AND SITUATION ETHICS,

which errors ultimately destroy all divine faith and morality, and all constituted authority. They make the person the centre and judge of all truth and morality irrespective of what the Church teaches. Herein lies the root of the modern evil."

Bishop ADRIAN should know: he was there. And so we have come full circle. The same observations were made, as we saw, by Grandmaster MITTERAND, only he did not call it evil: he called it liberation. And so also did, apparently, not a few bishops at the Second Vatican Council. They have apparently not changed their mind nor their theologians: the old periti are still around, as we will see later on.

#### CONCLUSION.

This conclusion of PART ONE serves as an Introduction to PART TWO, in which we will analyse the actual state of a diocese after it was exposed to cyclone Teilhard, and what this means for the future.

No doubt, many minds poisoned by Teilhardism, modernism and marxism were present during the deliberations of VATICAN II. But during the Sessions they were powerless against the direct protection from heresy, given by the Holy Spirit to the Catholic Church-in-Session in union with Her head, the Vicar of Christ on earth. The Holy Spirit used their minds too, to formulate what HE wanted, not what they wanted. But what proved impossible during Vatican II: that the Catholic Church would be handed over to Her enemies, became for the greater part a reality, when Her enemies got hold of the interpretations of Vatican II, DETERMINED TO CHANGE HER AFTER ALL.



The evil Teilhardism, as we saw, did not just happen overnight: it was carefully planned. But it hit an indifferent humanity, a group of Catholic bishops, Prelates, Priests and lay intellectuals: all weakened by the same dissatisfaction with the Catholic Church, and by their loss of faith in Her. THEY WANTED HER CHANGED. AND OVERNIGHT Teilhardism became the blue-print they had been looking for: to change the Church after their own ideas and fancies. The First Sin committed in Paradise, as we learned in the Catechism, darkened the human intellect. This is totally unacceptable to a modernist, so it can't be true.... This light was abundantly restored by Christ's Redemption in the Light of the Supernatural, divine Virtue of Catholic Faith. But this second 'Original Sin', committed by the West on the teachings of Teilhard: the sin of relegating the First Sin to the realm of MYTHS, has darkened again the minds of bishops, Priests and Religious, and what many Catholics see as abominable in the Light of their Catholic Faith: Teilhardism, became to all who lost this Supernatural Light, a blue-print for renewal, but a renewal NOT inspired by God, but seen in the torchlight of human thought.

The division between these two groups is the HIDDEN SCHISM which runs right through every diocese on earth, every parish, every convent, every presbytery, every seminary and probably every household. "There will be two people ostensibly doing the same thing", says Our Lord, "one will be accepted, the other will be rejected".

What this means will be analysed in greater detail in the next PART.



PART TWO.

THE FATAL CONSEQUENCES OF THIS HIDDEN  
SCHISM.

This Part will also consist of two chapters. CHAPTER THREE will deal with consequences which have already taken place in time; facts resulting from the hidden schism caused by the factors studied in the first two chapters. These facts can be verified by anyone who has access to the normal sources of information. Since I live in the Archdiocese of MELBOURNE, Australia, I can only deal with the situation as it developed there.

The final chapter of this paper is a view in the future. In it I will discuss what may logically <sup>be</sup> expected to happen given the situation as it exists today and given the forces that are working towards very definite ends.

"These European revolutionists, already during the Sessions of Vatican II and more so after, FLOODED this nation with their propaganda. Many of them, like Hans KUNG, Karl RAHNER, Charles DAVIS, SCHILLEBEECKX, BAUM, CONGAR appeared in person in America on the invitation of some bishop or 'educator'.

They wrote and distributed books and articles, they invaded our colleges and seminaries, even Catholic schools. Their propaganda was further abetted by the establishment-controlled liberal catholic press by sensational, slanted reporting.

Finally, a factor largely contributing to this revolutionary movement in the Church has been the silence and timidity of those whose grave duty is to call a halt to these anti-Catholic movements within the Church, chiefly the bishops.

And yet, Pope PAUL again and again admonished the bishops of the world to take a rigorous, courageous stand in preventing the spread of these abuses. But the voice of the Holy Father has remained almost alone in proclaiming the truths of the Catholic Church, in condemning the audacious voices of the SCHISMATICS, the heretics, the secularists and ~~in~~ deploring widespread flaunting of constituted authority. The do-nothing attitude of those in authority is greeted with satisfaction by revolutionists and reformers alike, and every day they are becoming more brazen in declaring with dictatorial voice 'THAT THEY ALONE ARE INTERPRETING WITH UNDERSTANDING THE SPIRIT OF VATICAN II', whereas in fact they are distorting and disobeying its decrees.

Even more, some liberal bishops are not only permitting, but also encouraging, EVEN TO GIVING ORDERS, flagrant disregard for some of the teaching of the Magisterium of the Church and the Decrees of Vatican II. *although* Since these radicals were stopped in the Council in their attempt to gain more power, by the authoritative voice of the Pope, they are nevertheless feverishly determined to CARRY OUT THEIR PROGRAM OF REFORM (BASED ON THE ABERRATIONS OF TEILHARD DE CHARDIN) IN DEFIANCE OF THE HOLY SEE."

(Bishop W. ADRIAN, Nashville, Ten.

The ring is all too familiar and too close to home for comfort in the Archdiocese of Melbourne. Out of the welter of information in the possession of hundreds of worried parents, Priests and Religious documenting attacks on almost any aspect of Catholic life during the reign of Archbishop KNOX, I have selected the three main areas of worry: CATECHETICS, THE EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS AND ITS ATTACK ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE BLESSED EUCHARIST and PRIESTLY TRAINING.

The whole is not a pretty picture. Many readers will be able to document parallel happenings in other dioceses.

A. THE UNDYING RESENTMENT AGAINST THE NEW CATECHESIS.

In 1970 there erupted in the pages of THE ADVOCATE and THE TRIBUNE, two Melbourne diocesan weeklies, a controversy about catechetics, which raged for more than SIX months and was finally quelled by methods that only Modernists can use in their peculiar 'love' for people. But the rumblings have gone on right up to this day. It must always been borne in mind that, although we are forced to deal with catechetics seemingly separately, it was never an item in isolation. All sorts of currents were running through the Archdiocese at the time, one of the most powerful to emerge was of course the preparation to the 40th Eucharistic Congress.

The immediate cause of the controversy was an article by the American Jesuit Fr. PFEIFER, which appeared in THE ADVOCATE of July 30, 1970, in which it was stated

"God reveals, not so much through words as through events.  
Christ is met, not in doctrinal formulations, rather He  
is met in the experience of life."

I share the opinion of many that this statement is heretical and meant to undermine Catholic Faith replacing it by EVOLUTION OF DOGMA, SITUATION ETHICS, PRIVATE INTERPRETATIONS AS TO THE MEANING OF THE 'EXPERIENCES': all fundamentally Teilhard de Chardin errors. In the article Fr. PFEIFER made it clear that this is the 'BASIC INSIGHT' to the whole new way of teaching religion: the life-situation method. And right from the start of the controversy it became clear that Fr. PFEIFER's catechetics were the official catechetics of the Melbourne CCD (or Confraternity for Christian Doctrine) the official body in the diocese dealing with religious instruction. One of the most telling observations in the controversy was made by a woman contributor who stated that, if this was such a revolutionary insight, so basic to the WHOLE of catechetics, then it surely must have been brought out clearly by Vatican II. But having gone through all the Council documents, she never came across the fundamental thesis or 'insight' nor on any other reference remotely resembling it.

Prior to this heated debate in the catholic press, there had appeared in the MAJELLAN, a Redemptorist monthly, of January, 1970, an article by the Rev. STINSON C.ss.R. called: "CRISIS IN CATECHETICS", in which Fr. STINSON showed with remarkable insight some of the objections parents had against the new catechetics, currently being canvassed as religious education. This article of Fr. Stinson brought a spate of letters to the MAJELLAN, clearly showing the existence of many disturbed parents.

No serious attempts and certainly no official attempts were being made to quieten the anxiety of parents and of teachers in the early months of 1970. But at the height of the major controversy (to be precise FIVE months after it had started in Sept. 1970) something approaching an official attempt to do something was made. E.g. a catechetical aid called SAY YES! under the auspices of the Melbourne CCD carried an article in its Supplement of Febr. 1971, entitled: 'WHERE HAVE ALL THE CATECHISMS GONE?', by Andrew HAMILTON S.J., which started off like this:

"Great changes have occurred in the Church during the last 10 years or so. Many of these changes have made some of us anxious. We feel vaguely (as far as catechetics goes this is certainly a misstatement: parents and teachers had been VERY DEFINITE what they objected to) that what we



have lost is good, that what we have gained to replace it has yet to prove itself. Perhaps more than anywhere else we feel this in the approaches taken to religious education in schools. At times this feeling is unspoken, (oh those modernists with their FEELINGS) at other times it erupts into complaints about the strange ideas that teachers are communicating to their students: ABOUT THEIR MYSTERIOUS RELUCTANCE TO MENTION GOD OR OUR LORD IN THEIR CLASSES, ABOUT THE POSTPONEMENTS OF FIRST COMMUNIONS, ABOUT REPORTS THAT CHILDREN HAVE BEEN TOLD THAT THEY NEED NO LONGER GO TO SUNDAY MASS..." (My stress, of course.)

The trend of the article is NOT to deny that children DO come home with these reports nor that such drastic changes are taking place, but that these changes are for the good. A careful reading of the article will reveal more: it shows that the author, far from meeting the difficulties of the parents, exhorts them instead to an IMPLICIT TRUST IN THE EXPERTS and to accept the new catechetics....

This most unhappy and unfortunate trend: to ignore the parents' profound anxiety and to make out that they are TO SAY THE LEAST unreasonable in being anxious has remained the official attitude in the Archdiocese of Melbourne to this day.

But what dismayed most was the fact that this whole article, trend and all, appeared with the official INPRIMATUR of Archbishop KNOX who had so far remained completely silent on the five months' old controversy. And so worried parents could be forgiven if they drew the conclusion 'that the reluctance of the teachers to mention God or Our Lord in their classes, the postponement of First Communion attempts, and the dissolution of the obligation to attend Sunday Mass for children' carries the approval of the Archbishop of Melbourne, since the article does not deny that these things happen but tries to explain them, to make people accept them.

Archbishop KNOX would like us to emphasise, as a matter of pastoral prudence, that we are not in any way abandoning the notion that Christ came to free us from sin in regard to the terms 'salvation-redemption'.

We urge all catechists to read the article 'Salvation-Redemption' in: 'A GUIDE TO TEACHING BIBLICAL THEMES'.

CRIPAC PRESS PTY.LTD., 203 DARLING RD. CAULFIELD EAST, 3145.

This little note was inserted into copies of the teachers' notes accompanying this particular issue of 'SAY YES'. As a matter of pastoral prudence, extreme Teilhardism better not be taught. This printed copy is proof that at least on one occasion the teaching of 'SAY YES' relative to salvation and redemption caused the Archbishop to give a corrective. If an Archbishop has reason to believe, as this one apparently had, that the modern 'aids', which in reality appear as the official texts since there are NO OTHERS, are in any way lacking of solid, sound doctrine, which don't forget the parents had been trying to tell him for the last 7 months, then he has the duty to terminate it. It is unbecoming of a bishop to try to rectify matters surreptitiously with little slips like this as inserts, and then half-apologetically ask teachers to somehow rectify matters as a matter of pastoral prudence. Note the date: for 7 months now, parents, teachers, catechists, nuns, brothers had been trying to tell their Archbishop that there was something seriously wrong with the catechesis of the Archdiocese. And the only POSITIVE response made so far by the Archbishop is a little note for the publishers telling them to be more prudent....

Both the TRIBUNE and the ADVOCATE of Febr. 4, 1971, report an address of his Grace, part of which was meant to reassure 'parents who were agitated and worried' about the developments in the field of religious instruction in the Archdiocese of Melbourne. Here are his quoted words:

"Speaking of religious instruction, may I avail myself of this occasion to give some reassurances to parents who are agitated and extremely worried about developments in this field here in the Archdiocese of Melbourne. I would assure them that in the near future a magnificent document dealing with the renewal of catechetics will be available. This document was published by the Hierarchy of Italy....Much has been written and spoken about the series known as 'COME ALIVE'. Many of those who have written and spoken have done so without first-hand knowledge of the text.

As Archbishop of Melbourne (at last, that sounds most official and impressive. What is he going to do?) I cherish the hope that these texts which are aids and not catechisms (where is the official catechism then?) will prove truly helpful to our teenagers....etc.etc.

The title of the article: 'CATECHETICS: ARCHBISHOP REASSURES PARENTS' (sic), made it look as if the Archbishop publicly intervened more than 5 months after the controversy had started, and more than a year after the alarmbells had started to ring in his own diocese. However, it becomes obvious from his speech that the Archbishop did not meet ONE SINGLE SPECIFIC OBJECTION OR COMPLAINT from the parents. In fact, he dismisses criticism against one of his personally sponsored 'aids': 'COME ALIVE' as criticisms written by many who, he claims, have no first-hand knowledge of the text, BUT HE FAILS TO MENTION THE CRITICISMS FROM MANY WHO HAD STUDIED THE TEXT WITH ABSOLUTE COMPETENCE AND HAD REJECTED THEM THOROUGHLY. We all know the booklet: "WHAT IS WRONG WITH 'COME ALIVE'."

Furthermore, the reassurances of the Archbishop do NOT rest on a firm promise to put a stop to erroneous texts, nor on a firm guarantee to see to the promotion of sound doctrine as would have been his duty. He rested his reassurances on two FUTURE documents: 1. the translation of the catechetical directory of the Italian bishops and 2. the teachers' manual to accompany this directory. He must have been aware of the fact that 99.9% of the worried parents would NEVER see these documents, let alone read them and be reassured by them. So, what DOES he do then 'as Archbishop of Melbourne'? He cherishes a hope.... May God have mercy on us.... Dr. KNOX appeared DEEPLY IMPLICATED in the spread of spurious catechetics in his diocese and later on all over Australia. His whole speech was just a sop.

#### THE FATHER MAURICE DUFFY AFFAIR.

In that same address Archbishop KNOX announced publicly that Fr. Maurice DUFFY would prepare 'an excellent teachers' manual' to go with the Directory. And so the question is legitimate: "Who is Father Maurice DUFFY?"

Fr. DUFFY answered that question himself on Mondaynight, 22nd March, 1971, in a major address on catechetical policy in Melbourne to the combined meeting of all the diocesan catechists-in-training for 1971. (I personally attended together with many others from GEELONG). Fr. DUFFY knew there was some explaining to do about the way he had left the service of his own diocese of SANDHURST and was almost overnight made a teacher on catechetics at the Chadstone teacher training college, where a few months prior to this particular meeting his very students had publicly criticised and rebuked bishop FOX of SALE (Victoria) for addressing them at their passing-out ceremony. Apart from other promotions in the catechetical field, Fr. DUFFY was also the 'spokesman' for the Episcopal Committee on catechesis.



By way of introduction that night of Mar.22, Fr.Duffy jokingly and disarmingly 'confessed' to his audience that he had played the enfant-terrible in Sandhurst, that his Bishop had tried several appointments for him, but had finally 'seen the light' and had allowed him to go to Melbourne....Laughter all around.

The first address of the evening had for sole purpose to impress on the audience that resistance to new methods of teaching is unintelligent, meaning: opposition to the life-situation method of teaching the catechism is unintelligent. The hard sell came afterwards in an address given by Fr.Duffy, teacher of catechetical methods at Chadstone, author of Dr.KNOX's 'aid' COME ALIVE, member of the Melbourne CCD, adviser on catechetical methods to the Australian Hierarchy and their spokesman on these matters....Quite impressive.

After the softening-up of the first effort, Fr.Duffy chose to ignore the overt references to the life-situation controversy, but it was his central theme. In a brilliant attempt he endeavoured to switch the opposition to the life-situation method into opposition to VERY ENLIGHTENED BISHOPS....People fighting this discredited method (remember, it was still raging in the catholic press) suddenly found themselves fighting bishops.

The core of Fr. Duffy's address was a running commentary on the new directory of the Australian Bishops (the one referred to by Dr. Knox) on the teaching of religion. Nobody had access to the text except Fr. Duffy, so that was very convenient. He really laid it on thick about the enlightened bishops. As a sign of their enlightenment he made literally the following remark:

"The very first sentence the bishops use here in this section runs like this: 'You are all teachers'. Now this is very significant. Twenty years ago the bishops would have said: 'The Pope is the Supreme teacher of the Church'. BY NO LONGER STRESSING THAT, the bishops in their enlightenment want to make it clear that we are all teachers".

That was the quality of his discours. It was the only mention the Holy Father got that evening: he was mentioned incidentally, as a side-issue, and even then only to get the brush-off. There was no bishop present to speak in defence of the Holy Father nor to speak in defence of the TRUE interpretation of their own directory. A grave error of judgement was committed that night to let a man as involved in modernism as Fr. Duffy is and who made it quite clear that night that he had left his own diocese under a cloud, speak for all the Bishops on such a sensitive matter as the interpretation of their own directory. But there was more to come.

As mentioned earlier: since this was an address 'to the converted', catechists of the diocese who had been subjected to this type of catechesis for quite some time, the life-situation method hardly needed a mention, but the controversy still had to be stopped and stopped THAT NIGHT ON THE ORDERS OF THE ARCHBISHOP. That this was the main issue of the evening came out when Fr. Duffy finally told his audience how Archbishop Knox had confided in him before one of his regular trips to Rome: HOW SORRY HE WAS TO SEE THE CATHOLICS OF MELBOURNE INDULGE IN THEIR FAVORITE PASTIME: TEARING AT EACH OTHER IN THEIR PRESS. IT GOT TO STOP. That was the clearest indication of what Fr. Duffy wanted that night:

"CATHOLICS OF MELBOURNE: STOP OPPOSING PUBLICLY THE LIFE-SITUATION METHOD OF TEACHING RELIGION. YOU ARE WOUNDING THE HEART OF YOUR OWN ARCHBISHOP".

One could not have a more complete identification of targets. Bishop ADRIAN was right: there are bishops who even GIVE ORDERS to allow the spread of modernism. This was an ORDER if ever there was one and Fr. Duffy made it clear from whom the

order came. And this, notwithstanding the fact that NO CATHOLIC in Melbourne during this controversy did attack his own Archbishop. But Fr.DUFFY's own students in Chadstone had publicly attacked a Bishop in the execution of his duty, not only in his presence, BUT ALSO IN THE CATHOLIC PRESS, for which NO STUDENT, NO FR.DUFFY, NO DR. KNOX had ever publicly apologised. So Fr.Duffy condones a gross and inexcusable attack on a bishop IN THE CATHOLIC PRESS, but decries a legitimate controversy in the press AS AN ATTACK ON THE ARCHBISHOP HIMSELF....The inference is all too obvious: not only does Dr. KNOX want the opposition to the life-situation method silenced, that very night Fr.Duffy pointed out to his followers how to go about achieving that: make out it is an attack on the bishops.

The immediate result of the evening is of course THREEFOLD:

1. The modernists are left off the hook. No longer are they required to refute the arguments of their opponents: simply hang a 'disloyalty charge' around their neck.
2. Because the pretence has now been created that the enlightened bishops are on the side of the life-situation innovators, the silent Church of 'old-fashioned not-with-it-people and reactionaries' has been created for whom NOBODY in power has cared a damn since.
3. The Directory is now a very handy book to quote from AGAINST any Bishop who dares to interfere with the life-situation innovators' plans for 'renewal'. The attack on bishop FOX showed that they dared to do it with the official blessing of their modernist teachers and that they can get away with it. On top of that the impression has now been created that the bishops of Australia now officially teach: that the Holy Father is only one of many teachers. WE know of course better than that, but this is the type of thing that modernists all over the place get away with nowadays (and much worse) AND THEY BELIEVE IT.

So that was that. The modernists closed ranks around the Archbishop against these dreadful catholics. Fr.DUFFY got another promotion: after the folding up of THE TRIBUNE in March, 1971, at the time of this fateful night, Fr.DUFFY was appointed CENSOR of 'Letters to the ADVOCATE' on catechetical matters while the most loyal editor CUMMINGHAM got the sack 'because he did not implement the decrees of Vatican II....Both measures were taken by the Board of Directors of the ADVOCATE, on which FR.REBESCHINI, private secretary to Dr.KNOX has the greatest influence. Naturally, with such policies and such a censor the controversy fizzled out. The 'silent majority' was effectively muzzled....THE ADVOCATE became a truly modernist paper. And the famous directory? NOBODY in the CCD takes the slightest notice of it.

Since then there have been THREE PETITIONS to the Archbishop and the Senate of Priests (one was even publicly discussed in the ADVOCATE) which did not have the slightest effect..A well-known PP, Fr.D.BYRNE got applauded one Sunday-morning at Mass when he pointed out to his parishioners their prime duty to check the way catechetics was taught at the catholic school. He received more than 500 letters from all over Australia, some exceedingly revealing....

The 'PARENTS AND FRIENDS ORGANIZATION' in desperation set up its own committee to investigate the charges and was appalled at what it discovered when it checked current teaching as against the Catechetical Directory from Card.WRIGHT. Its highly documented report was just completed when Card.KNOX left for Rome to take up his new appointment. The battle in Melbourne is far from over.



B. THE MELBOURNE EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS.

The foundations for the 40th International Eucharistic Congress were laid in Europe. It is not hard to guess by whom.

Teilhard de Chardin had no time for Eucharistic Congresses. In his 1929 essay "THE HUMAN SENSE", in which he formally broke with catholicism, an essay so revealing and top-secret that even his atheist publishers have never dared to publish it in full for fear of giving the game away, he declares that he, Teilhard, is a privileged being who has been allowed to see that the religious sense, the origin, according to the modernists of all religious experiences and religion up to now, (see PASCENDI for description and condemnation) was somehow transformed by evolution into the human sense, that is the building of the modern world. In making this human sense the 'new religion' of 20th century man, he could not help but notice in the same article that this clashes violently with Catholicism. And so, to give himself stature and authority TO CHANGE THE CATHOLIC CHURCH TO HIS OWN VISION, he boldly compares himself with Buddha and Mohammed, declaring that he is a figure far more serious and revolutionary and truly greater than they were. He does not yet suggest in the same article any superiority to Jesus Christ, but three years earlier, on the occasion of a Eucharistic Congress which especially enraged him when he read of it in the newspapers, he expressed the ambition TO TAKE THE SPOTLIGHT AWAY FROM CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST, to become the focus of the religion of the crowd of men which as yet was flocking to the Eucharist to adore it. Soon afterwards he 'received the inspiration' to write THE DIVINE MILIEU and, as he himself expressed it, 'reveal to the general public the secret opinions about christianity which until then he had only tried to propagate within the seminaries!

TO TAKE AWAY THE SPOTLIGHT FROM CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST....That is the clue to what happened in Melbourne. But let us start with the beginning.

1970 was a busy year for the theologians. Firstly, by then a book had appeared on the market called: "INTERCOMMUNION - WITH ROME?" by the Swede Dr. VILMOS VAJTA, Director of the Centre for Ecumenical Studies at STRASBOURG. Ordinary Catholics can learn a lot from it concerning the 'top people' of their own Church and about the studies in which they are engaged, with the aim of 'inventing' a United World Religion. The book describes in detail how they are prepared to give up the term 'TRANSUBSTANTIATION' to replace it by the vaguer term 'REAL PRESENCE' which Protestants also could use. They are ready to let the Sacrifice disappear, leaving nothing more than a Supper to the memorial of Christ, acceptable to all. They also want to eliminate the distinction, so clearly made by the Council of Trent, between the Catholic Priest and the Protestant minister. The only 'minor' difference would be that, while the latter is endowed from below with an extraordinary charismatic ministry, the former exercises THE SAME MINISTRY, but in his case bestowed by a 'sacramental rite' CARRIED OVER FROM A SYSTEM NOW OBSOLETE.... It is of the utmost importance that the reader keeps the contents of this little book in mind for the remainder of this article. The message of the book is painfully clear: do away with the foundation laid by Christ Himself and replace it with a new one 'we all can accept': a Eucharist without Transubstantiation.

Next, with these thoughts and theories clearly spelt out, the FIFTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION opened at EVIAN for a week of studies from 14-21 July, 1970. There were some Catholic observers. The Assembly was addressed

by Card. NILLEBRANDS. Each of the FOUR points mentioned above were discussed and agreed upon in the modernist sense. Furthermore, the meeting condemned 'HUMANAE VITAE' and the motu proprio on Mixed Marriages as being out of touch with present day thinking and in conflict with the views of many theologians. Dr. KRUSTON, chairman, expressed his 'concern' over the recent encyclicals concerning the Eucharist, but also on this point he was convinced that

"even problems of such delicacy as the PAPACY itself would lose much of their gravity if their SYMBOLIC VALUE were understood."

Exactly the same as the radical bishops had tried to tell the Council Fathers during Vatican II. So the thought is kept alive. The Pope goes out, the foundation laid by Christ Himself, and in comes an emasculated 'supper' but much more: a collegial ecumenism. The quest for power....The dream of the new ecumenism. Is it only the Protestants who talk in this way?

A few months only later, from Sept. 12-17, 1970, to be precise, a WORLD CONGRESS OF THEOLOGIANs was held in BRUSSELS, under the fatherly hand of Card. SUENENS, primate of Belgium, and under the chairmanship of Prof. SCHILLEBEECKX from Holland. Taking part were BROWN, RAHNER, KUNG, BAUM, GREELEY, CONGAR and lesser lights, all disciples of the great names. I repeat the observation made about these men by the late Bishop ADRIAN:

"These European periti who really imposed their theories on the bishops were themselves deeply imbued with the errors of Teilhardism and situation ethics..."

Well, they hadn't changed. In fact they were even more vitriolic. The theme of the congress was: "THE FUTURE OF THE CHURCH" and what a future they envisage.... Their clear-sightedness about the requirements of the new Teilhard de Chardin church of the future had considerably increased. In order to appreciate that, just listen to the words of CONGAR at the closing session:

"The Brussels resolutions go much further than Vatican II. Because the evolution of society has accelerated since then, we can no longer content ourselves with the mere application of the conciliar texts, AND ONE OF THE DIFFICULTIES FACING THE PRESENT PONTIFICATE IS THAT IT DOES SEEK TO RESTRICT ITSELF TO THESE. We must ask ourselves whether the time of reforms ought not to make place now for the task OF FOUNDING THE CHURCH ANEW...."

So, barely 5 or 6 years after Vatican II where the Holy Ghost PREVENTED these heretics from running away with the Church, the Pope is now being accused of sticking to the decisions laid down there and is being accused of not founding the Church anew by taking their advice. There is not a shadow of a doubt that these people are determined to disseminate into the catholic camp the ideas and theories expressed by VAJTA and the LUTHERAN CONVENTION earlier that year, ideas which came from these men in the first place anyhow. Hans KUNG's paper was the most outspoken in undermining everything the Church had acquired from God. According to him

"...the whole message expressed in timeless and universal terms becomes just one word: Jesus Christ. All the rest is embellishment..."

So there you have it in a nutshell: catholic is the same as protestant because both acknowledge Jesus Christ. There is really no difference between the Catholic Mass and the Protestant communion service, or between a Priest ordained in the Catholic



Church and a Protestant minister: that is only a question of embellishment. Why? Because Hans KUNG says so. And just as their master Teilhard, these men are actively in the process of turning the spotlight away from Christ and turning it on themselves as the architects of this new church they are creating. The church of freedom from laws and creeds (RAHNER's paper), the church of no sexual restrictions (BAUM) and with a democratic government (GREELY). This is teilhardism in practice. If these are the sentiments, thoughts, theories and determined efforts of the highpriests of teilhardism, of the men deeply imbued with his errors, then there is food for thought for any starry-eyed admirer of this 'mystical poet'. Because it were these very men who forced on Melbourne the hybrid Eucharistic Congress (with its COMWAY "OMEGA-POINT PLAY!..."), a congress that did not even leave a ripple the day after it was finished.

✓ The first shot was fired one Tuesday, Nov. 30, 1971, at 12.40 pm with an Australian Broadcasting Commission's news item during the Victorian State news service. Here it is verbatim in full, as obtained from the A.B.C. on request:

"Leaders of nearly all major christian denominations in Victoria have issued a joint letter calling on their congregations to work in unity to further the christian Gospel.

The letter is signed by the heads of the Anglican, Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, Methodist, Quaker and 6 other denominations.

It welcomes the strengthening of ties between christians evident during the past year and asks church members to pray for the success of the ecumenical movement.

The letter says Christmas 1971 should be seen as a time TO REAFFIRM THE SINGLE FACT OF FAITH IN CHRIST AS BEING THE ONE ESSENTIAL REQUIREMENT FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY. (See note 1).

Special studies to be carried out by the combined churches during the year (1972) include discussions aimed at reaching agreement ON A SINGLE FORM OF COMMUNION SERVICE FOR UNIVERSAL USE. (See note 2.)

At today's ceremony the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Melbourne, Dr. KNOX, said he found it wonderful that the churches should unite in such a program of christian renewal. (See note 3.)

The Anglican Primate of Australia, Dr. MOODS, said he hoped 1972 would be a year in which all christians worked together to deepen their faith and zeal."

When the cathedral was contacted about this broadcast, Fr. REBESCHINI confirmed that it was a true reflection of what had taken place. Dr. KNOX had given a press interview after the ceremony and most of it came from him. He divulged that a three-tier studyplan was set up for next year and that other denominations would be invited to join catholic groups in the discussions as a preparation for the Eucharistic Congress. So it was authoritatively stated that this ceremony was in preparation to the Eucharistic Congress. If that is so then let us look at

NOTE 1: If one compares these words with the one quoted above from Hans KUNG's paper: the message is just one word: Jesus Christ, and if 'today's ceremony' is in preparation to the Eucharistic Congress, then it becomes obvious that 'today's ceremony' is meant to introduce KUNG's MESSAGE into the preparation for the Eucharistic Congress.

NOTE 2: We just saw that with his paper Hans KUNG gave his blessing to the theology of VAJTA's book and the LUTHERAN CONVENTION. And so with these words of the broadcast, the theology of VAJTA and the Lutheran Convention were introduced by today's ceremony into the preparation for the Eucharistic Congress. It was by now obvious that a determined attempt was being made TO TURN THE SPOTLIGHT AWAY FROM CHRIST IN THE COMING CONGRESS AND FOCUS IT ON A TEILHARD INSPIRED ECUMENISM.

If European Teilhardists had taken over the congress and its preparation, sharing Teilhard's distaste for the attention given to Christ in the Blessed Eucharist and all obsessed with his false ecumenism, then it became a simple bet:

- (a) That the procession would be done away with.
- (b) That the Holy Father would NOT be in attendance.
- (c) *1 a* That it would be an ecumenical congress on teilhard fancies of world populations, poverty, ecumenism, racism, etc. But NOT on Transubstantiation, the beautiful Encyclicals on the Blessed Eucharist, Mary etc.

I still have in my possession a copy of a letter to Dr.KNOX in which I expressed my confidence that the Holy Father would NOT attend. The letter was dated Mar. 28, 1972, almost a year before the Congress.

NOTE 3: One may think that the study of the ONE COMMUNION SERVICE was fulfilled when the thoroughly modernistic book UNIT THREE: EUCHARIST AND LIFE had swept Australia, not with an IMPRIMATUR, that would have been impossible, but with Dr.KNOX's photo. However, as will come out later, something far more far-reaching was being carried out, something that even more rivetted the European ideas to the Melbourne Archdiocese.

After the stage had been carefully set for a Teilhard-inspired Congress, several things happened:

1. Many Catholics became suspicious and lost interest.
2. Many Protestants mistrusted the whole set-up and never took part.
3. The Papal Encyclical "MYSTERY OF FAITH", a jewel amongst the Papal documents, was unobtainable from the H.Q., banned, forgotten, not important and was kept just as far away from the Congress as its Sacred Subject-Matter would be.
4. But a completely new treatise on the Eucharist was written for the purpose, UNIT THREE: EUCHARIST AND LIFE, which had just as much to do with "MYSTERY OF FAITH", the Holy Father, Catholic Faith and the Blessed Eucharist as Teilhard himself.
5. The Holy Father declined THREE personal invitations to attend and instead went to a local Eucharistic Congress.
6. The procession with the Blessed Sacrament WAS abolished. Reason given: the Anglicans requested it....
7. A request by Dr. KNOX to ROME to allow the distribution of Holy Communion to ANYONE who presented him/herself at the Statio Orbis as a true sign of unity was turned down. After having wrecked the whole show, this would have been the final triumph of the European organisers. And so the silent protest of the ecumenical service was held as a 'sign of unity': biscuits which ought to have been Communion.....

Father KENNETH BAKER S.J. summed it all up rather well with his article in the National Catholic REGISTER, entitled: "ECUMENIC ATTEMPT WEAKENS CONGRESS" from which the following extract:

"For the first time in the history of the Congress there was no large-scale procession with the Blessed Sacrament as a public manifestation of Catholic belief in the Eucharist....The Congress generally speaking did not attract the anticipated crowds: 100,000 visitors expected, only 20,000 turned up. Fr. TOOMEY expected confidently 100,000 people to turn up at the ecumenical service, the official tally was 27,000. Among the Catholics in Australia there is considerable controversy over the nature of the congress....A well-known Australian Jesuit told me he thought the Melbourne congress would kill the whole movement started in 1881. He could be right. Catholics are not prepared to make sacrifices for a Congress THAT IS NOT REALLY EUCHARISTIC."

WHATEVER IS TOUCHED BY A TEILHARD DE CHARDIN INSPIRED RENEWAL LOOKS INFINITELY WORSE AFTER THE EXPERIENCE THAN IT EVER LOOKED BEFORE. THE MELBOURNE CONGRESS PROVED TO BE NO EXCEPTION. WILL IT BE DIFFERENT WITH THE RENEWAL OF THE PRIESTHOOD?



C. THE "RENEWAL" OF THE SEMINARY TRAINING.

The Church in Australia has had a proud record of the solid way in which She has cared for the training of her aspiring Priests. There are signs in this area that another spirit has taken over, and the seminary training has become the battleground between the Spirit of God and the spirit of Teilhard. It is easy to start this topic with an a priori, something that goes like this. It is inconceivable that bishops who have allowed Teilhardists to dominate their CCD's would uncompromisingly and resolutely resist their dominant influence in the formation of their Priests, where, according to Teilhard's own boast, he had altogether his most receptive audience years before any organized resistance was mounted against him. So it is to be expected that the seminary training in Melbourne leaves much to be desired and then leave it at that as if the case has been conclusively dealt with. I hope that people who reason like this draw the only valid conclusion and go on their knees to pray a bit more to Almighty God for their Priests and their Bishops and the Seminarians.

The Catholic Church has been just as clear and persistent in resisting the influence of Teilhard over the last 50 or so years as She has been clear and consistent in Her demand that the candidates for the Priesthood be solidly brought up on the philosophy of St. THOMAS and the theology based on his principles. The universal disobedience to these two directives has resulted in the most ghastly confusion in priestly training. Young Priests and not so young ones too seem to live in make-shift shelters of Bonhoefferian spirituality, Teilhardian evolutionism, Bergsonian existentialism and Protestant theology. There seems to be no end to the 'renewal days' where do-it-yourself repair kits from the latest 'experts' are handed out to patch up the dilapidated dwellings. In the greater Geelong area where I live I have heard the pulpit used to declare: 1. That Adam and Eve are really only a myth, or else, they are ALL OF US; 2. That the existence of hell is doubtful; 3. That the Gospels are not authentic history but folklore for the use of the early christians; 4. That Original Sin in modern theology is being accepted as being 'all the evil in the world'; 5. That baptism of children means nothing, absolutely nothing, without the commitment of the parents; 6. That what remains of a man after death is the memory of him; 7. That the Church does not encourage to pray the Rosary. (This one on the Feast of the Holy Rosary). I have sat through innumerable sermons on UNRELATED love, love in a vacuum...

There appears to be utter confusion on: SOUL, SUPERNATURAL LIFE, (MORTAL) SIN, GRACE, SANCTIFYING GRACE, PENANCE + MORTIFICATION, THE CROSS AND THE PASSION, CONTRITION, CATHOLIC FAITH, VIRTUES, TRUTH and above all: THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

I want to make two things crystal clear here:

- (a) I do not criticise in any way a young Priest: I adore what he holds in his sacred hands after the Consecration, even if he himself has a defective faith as coming out of his sermons; I am friendly with them and often like them as persons.
- (b) I completely dissociate myself from, and utterly reject the explanations and aims and objectives and methods of the Australian Latin Mass Association. I am not a member, never was one and never will be. In particular I reject their explanation that the whole confusion in the Church is caused by the NOVUS ORDO. Like anything else perfectly orthodox in the Catholic

Church, the NOVUS ORDO is also subject to Teilhard de Chardin mistreatment, which can turn it into a sorry spectacle. But that is NOT inherent to the Novus Ordo.

So far we have been skirting the subject. What are the documents?

1. The official documents of the Church dealing with the formation of the candidates to the Priesthood are so numerous and detailed that it is impossible to even enumerate them here. They have not changed much over the years. The ones from Vatican II must of course be understood and interpreted in the light of what went before. They all stress holyness, interior life, union with Christ, prayer, frequent use of the Sacraments as the soundest foundation for a fruitful apostolate.
2. What about the Church's condemnations of Teilhard de Chardin?
  - (a) The Supreme Authority of the Holy Office in a Decree dated 15th Nov. 1957, forbade the works of de Chardin to be retained in libraries including those of Religious Institutes. His books were not to be sold in Catholic bookshops and were not to be translated in other languages.
  - (b) A Decree of the Holy Office, dated June 20, 1962, under the authority of Pope JOHN XXIII himself, warned that "...it is obvious that in philosophical and theological matters the said works of de Chardin are replete with ambiguities or rather with serious errors which offend Catholic Doctrine. That is why the Reverend Fathers of the Holy Office urge all Bishops, Superiors, Rectors to effectively protect, especially the minds of the young, against the dangers of the works of Fr. Teilhard de Chardin and his followers."

- (c) The Vicariate of Rome in a Decree dated Sept. 30, 1963, required that catholic booksellers in Rome should withdraw from circulation the works of de Chardin together with those books which favour his erroneous doctrines. (Pope PAUL)
- (d) The MONITA have not been disregarded by the Holy See. A query sent to the Sacred Congregation through the Apostolic Delegate in Washinton DC asking this precise question, received the following reply: "The judgements and dispositions made by the Congregation concerning the writings of Teilhard de Chardin have not been changed. Thus the MONITUM of June 30, 1962 continues in effect." (8/3/67).
- (e) Further re-affirmations: Oct. 20, 1967, Mar. 23, 1970, and Aug. 4, 1971, coming from Apostolic Delegates but on the Instructions of the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith, remove all possible doubt on this matter.

3. In 1973 Franjo Cardinal SEPER, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith had reason to write directly to Archbishop KNOX complaining about the teaching at the Archdiocesan Seminary. In his letter the Cardinal listed four objections which requested correction. They were:

- (a) No Thomistic emphasis. In other words the candidates for the Priesthood were subjected to a patchwork of theological fare. There still does NOT exist a systematic philosophy course in the Melbourne Catholic College.
- (b) Protestant bibliography. The significance of this will be brought out later.
- (c) The dogmatic tracts ON THE INCARNATION and ON THE ASSUMPTION OF MARY are established Revealed Truths and may not be taught as 'opinions'.
- (d) The MONITA re Teilhard de Chardin. In other words they were not *being addressed to.*



If this type of intervention from Rome is necessary then it can be safely stated that a Catholic College is a breeding ground of modernism. A Cardinal writing from Rome can obviously only write about the most obvious excesses. Non-adherence therefore to the monita re Teilhard de Chardin are therefore considered by Card. SEPER as a serious matter.

4. At the time of the revelation to the world of the 'substantial agreement' reached between Catholic and Anglican theologians, the so-called WINDSOR Agreement, or Statement, Archbishop KNOX revealed in THE ADVOCATE of 27 Jan., 1972, THAT THE PRESBYTERIAN POSITION WAS CLOSER TOO. Well, I have in my possession one of those very private papers used in the discussions between the Catholic and the Presbyterian team. It is a paper on INTERCOMMUNION and is called the CATHOLIC contribution. I have heard and read many statements by theologians which I expected to be called 'heretical' by some other theologian whom I suspected to be 'more in love with truth than with Plato' as the saying is. But no, theologians will bend backwards to accommodate such a statement somehow, somewhere 'within the pale'. But in this case a theologian of repute who was asked to evaluate this paper had no hesitation to call this paper in part HERETICAL in context. The other less damning phrases used by him were: erroneous, faulty, contrary to Church's teaching, misleading, irrelevant, grievous error....It is for me of the utmost importance to read that this theologian calls the paper heretical where it teaches that

"Protestant churches have valid priesthood so that catholics can receive Chris's Body and Blood in a Protestant communion service."

So if this is the CATHOLIC contribution on an official level and the author of this paper teaches seminarians during the day time, then Card. SEPER's objection to Protestant bibliography takes on an ominous significance:

if this is the top secret 'official' teaching in the Archdiocese of Melbourne on the Priesthood, then no seminary professor would want his students to find out from REAL Catholic books what is the REAL Catholic teaching on the Priesthood.

But there is more to it than this. I must refer the reader here once again to the Australian Broadcasting Commission's MENSITEM of NOV. 30, 1971, as quoted on page 24 of this article:

"Special studies to be carried out by the combined churches during the year (1972) include discussions aimed at reaching agreement ON A SINGLE FORM OF COMMUNION SERVICE FOR UNIVERSAL USE",

and further remind him that, according to Fr. REBESCHINI himself, this information was communicated to the press by Archbishop KNOX himself. Now the full meaning of this newsitem comes home to us. Not only would the churches on a popular level discuss these matters while using the text of UNIT THREE: EUCHARIST AND LIFE in preparation for the Eucharistic Congress, as requested by the European ecumenists, it now appears that the stranglehold of these theologians on the Archdiocese is even far greater: the top level discussions now reveal complete acceptance of the demands by VAJTA and the LUTHERANS. The broadcast not only reveals that these talks were held with the Archbishop's blessing: he was aware of the individual topics. If this 'grievously erroneous' 'catholic' contribution to the discussion on INTERCOMMUNION was delivered and discussed in 1972, and the orthodox theologian's assessment was signed in Febr. 1974, then it must have taken TWO YEARS before this scandalous state of affairs was leaked out and came to light. No wonder, with this sort of 'catholic' contribution, Archbishop Knox could state in the ADVOCATE of Jan. 1972: *that the Presbyterian position had come closer to...*

Dr. KNOX's transfer to Rome is still a somewhat mysterious affair to many minds. The speculation is idle since what is available appear to be only straws in the wind. There are indications that the sudden departure from Melbourne shocked and disappointed him. In his parting words he said he was sorry and sad to leave Melbourne. Rome itself appeared not to be quite ready for him: there wasn't any time to fuse the two Secretariats he now heads, although this was the intention. So there are indications that his departure from Melbourne was hurried which hint, not to a promotion, but to a transfer to get him out of Melbourne.

- We have seen that over the years Archbishop KNOX identified himself
- with spurious catechetics and the stifling of public protests against it;
- with the probable killing of the future Eucharistic Congresses as they were known in the past in exchange of some hybrid gathering;
- with the alarming decline in the proper training of the candidates for the Priesthood;
- with the development of a false ecumenism by allowing questionable contributions in very private but top-level discussions along the lines mapped out by VAIJA and the European ecumenists.....

Dr. Knox knew that the Administration of the diocese was in chaos. Deep divisions had appeared between him and his immediate entourage which could scarcely be kept from becoming public. The school provident fund was in great difficulties. Parishes are forced to borrow heavily against the 1975 allocation of Federal funds which are very uncertain in view of the cessation of the 'per capita' rule of financing private schools. He sold Church property at less than half the market value without the consent of the Catholic Trust, as if it was HIS to dispose of. The training program of his seminarians came under scrutiny and was in need of rebuke and correction from Rome. His disastrous catechetics course was finally rejected by his own Parents and Friends Organization when it was checked against the Catechetical Directory from Rome and found gravely wanting.

Did all this require from him a final, desperate bid? Maybe we will never know. But here are the facts.

Early in May, 1974, His Excellency the Apostolic Pro-Nuncio in Australia, Archbishop Gino PARO, discretely sent around to Senior Clergy of the Archdiocese of Melbourne, and to some selected lay people, an open BALLOT PAPER, on which they were to write names of suitable candidates as successors to Card. KNOX.

Exactly a week later EVERY PRIEST of the Archdiocese of Melbourne (and Goodness only knows how many lay people) received a personal letter from Card. KNOX, asking each one, under the secrecy of the Confessional, to fill out an enclosed BALLOT PAPER with the names of the candidates of his choice, which could of course include his own (Knox's) name and to return this ballot paper directly to him in Rome. The papers had been prepared in Rome, sent in bulk to the Cathedral and from there sent to every Priest. There was an astonishing 'rider' to his letter to the Priests: IF FOR SOME REASON PEOPLE CIRCULARISED DID NOT WANT TO AVAIL THEMSELVES OF THIS OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE KNOWN PERSONALLY TO HIM THEIR CHOICE OF HIS SUCCESSOR, WOULD THEY PLEASE SIGN THE ATTACHED SLIP AND POST IT TO HIM SO HE COULD KEEP A RECORD IF THEY HAD RECEIVED HIS COMMUNICATION....

These are the facts together with one more: that many Priests found this interference in ordinary canonical processes highly irregular and annoying. The imposition of the highest form of canonical secrecy, used only in the salvation of souls, to cover a scheming act, borders on intimidation and <sup>is</sup> unworthy of a Cardinal.



The Holy Father, Pope PAUL VI, has stated according to the "OSSERVATORE ROMANO" of NOV. 23, 1972

"that the watering down of the Spirit of the Gospel is a sure sign by which one can recognize the activity of the devil within the Catholic Church."

The Spirit of the Gospel is one of Eternal Truth. It is eternally opposed to the diabolical spirit of teilhardism. Does, <sup>not</sup> what I have said in this article, show that the Spirit of the Gospel has been at least watered down in the teachings in the Archdiocese of Melbourne during the reign of Archbishop KNOX? And did we not trace this 'watering down' to the diabolical spirit of teilhardism to which most of the Catholic life in the Archdiocese became gradually subjected? And is it too much to speak of a HIDDEN SCHISM?.....

+

+

+

Hidden schisms have the habit of breaking out into the open.... Our description of the aftermath of Vatican II within the boundaries of the Melbourne Archdiocese will be recognized by many as being the true picture of the state of things the world over. You don't have to be a regular reader of the many excellent publications and periodicals which keep the Light of Faith burning, to realize that literally thousands of Catholics have been trying for years now to tell their bishops that there is something seriously wrong, not only with the interpretations and implementations of the Decrees and Spirit of Vatican II but also with the general paralysis and silence of the Hierarchies in the face of it. Some, mainly the members of the Latin Mass Associations, at least in Australia, have gone overboard in declaring Vatican II itself heretical and evil and consequently also His Holiness Pope PAUL. They are now obviously floundering in a make-belief of their own. But there are millions of good, solid, staunch Catholics the world over who love the Holy Father and their Bishops and Priests, who love the Church as they have known it and still recognize it; who, BECAUSE THEY HAVE KEPT THEIR SUPERNATURAL CATHOLIC FAITH AND THE LIGHT IT CONTAINS, trust the Holy Spirit in their innate abhorrence of anything that is tainted with the diabolical spirit of MODERNISM, and who are still mistrusted by their Bishops. The Bishops, apparently seem to be of the opinion, when they close their doors and their hearts and their catholic weeklies and their eyes and their ears to these catholics, that they should trust the Holy Ghost more in the type of renewal that they, the bishops, propose. But I think personally, that it should be the other way around: the bishops should trust the Holy Spirit more as motivating these catholics not to accept <sup>just</sup> any renewal as coming from Vatican II.

I think that quite a number of responsible people within the Catholic Church have come to the conclusion that there is developing today, what Card. NEWMAN so aptly described as a 'suspense in the function of the teaching Church' during the 60 year period of ARIAN heresy. Although Card. NEWMAN was called to Rome over this statement, he was nevertheless vindicated and his pending canonization proves his works are free from error. For a detailed discussion on this very

interesting topic, read: "CARDINAL NEWMAN AND AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH", by the Rt.Rev.Mgr.Philip FLANAGAN, DD.,PH.D.,issued as an APPROACHES SUPPLEMENT.

From what we can gather, this Hidden Schism is worldwide. A large section of christendom has - for reasons we were at pains to explain in detail in this article - VOLUNTARILY placed itself in a modernistic camp guided by the principles of Teilhard. THE NATURAL OUTCOME FOR A LARGE SECTION OF CHRISTENDOM, WHICH VOLUNTARILY SELECTED TO BE GUIDED BY TEILHARD DE CHARDIN INTERPRETATIONS OF VATICAN II, IS TO BE RULED FOR A WHILE BY A HEAD OF THEIR OWN MAKING. To be ruled by an anti-pope, the greatest evil that can befall a considerable section of christendom (for the True Church, however small, will NEVER be ruled by an anti-pope, even if leaderless for some time) must be seen as a severe punishment by God for the greatest crime of them all: CORPORATE APOSTASY. And so, people who liked to listen to Teilhard and his interpretations of Catholicism in order to be encouraged to follow their own consciences,"WOULD LOVE TO HAVE THEIR EARS TICKLED", as St. PAUL warned us would happen, in 2 Tim.iv,4, by a 'pope' who will make it all 'official'.

I fully realize of course that we are entering very dangerous ground here, but as always, I am guided by documentation. Before however acquainting you with the evidence we have, I want to make a couple of points clear.

1. It is quite within the bounds of the possible that the schismatic teilhard-church can foist on the world by unlawful means an anti-pope, preventing for a while the selection of a true pope, and that this anti-pope will falsely unite christendom in a United World Religion, the dream of the communists, freemasons and modernists. Since this aspect so obviously touches on what I have called a parallel development in secular society, it is of the utmost importance that one branches out sideways and STUDY this parallel development.
2. If, out of the turmoil and ferment sweeping the Church at present time, a successor to Pope PAUL is eventually chosen, and he looks to us a most unsuitable candidate, we cannot, on that fact alone, reject him. For, if he is the lawfully chosen Pope, he will be protected from heresy-teaching like all his predecessors UNDER THE NORMAL CONDITIONS FOR INFALLIBILITY. And on the other hand, if an ostensibly neutral anti-pope is foisted on the Church by unlawful means, then he will obviously NOT be protected by this tremendous privilege, no matter how the schismatics will force his decisions on the Church as binding. In other words: we can NOT go by the colour of the man with the tiara, nor by his mode of selection, which will be secret.

Here we can only do what ST. THOMAS taught us in his beautiful hymn Adoro Te devote: "SED AUDITU SOLO TUTO CREDITUR". We can only safely believe WHEN HEARING. When the man with the tiara opens his mouth to contradict another Pope's teaching, then we safely know. So, here again, it is stressed that we MUST know our Catholic Faith. As we all know so well: LISTENING TO THE HOLY FATHER is not a pastime specifically encouraged by the teilhardians, but it will be forced upon us when they got their man usurping the throne of St. PETER.

And now for the evidence of all this. I will stick here to specifically catholic documentation, but as said before, there is overwhelming evidence that we are approaching a climax of sorts in contemporary secular literature which cannot be ignored.

To facilitate this process of making the anti-pope appear to be the real thing, the modernists, in careful preparation and anticipation, have forced upon the Church a whole host of their pet ideas, so that all their man eventually has to do is TO CONFIRM WHAT ~~WAS~~ ALREADY BEEN 'TAUGHT' PREVIOUSLY. And it is precisely in this area that the silence of ~~most~~ bishops has created the same 'suspense in the



function of the teaching Church'(with the clear exception of the Pope and some very courageous bishops) as confused the Church for 60 years under Arianism in the 4th century. For, if Teilhard de Chardin errors DID appear with INPRIMATURS in all sorts of publications, from CCD hand-outs and 'aids' to UNIT THREE, OUR LIVING FAITH, DUTCH CATECHISM, etc. and they were NOT opposed by the majority of bishops, then an anti-pope will have NO TROUBLE 'proving' that it was taught before and all he does is confirm the fact.

It is important, therefore, to compile a list of these pet-teachings of the modernists, NEVER TOUCHED BY THE MAGISTERIUM but crept in many publications nevertheless, so that, when the time comes, people can hang on to their Faith "as handed down from the Apostles".

There have been made several attempts, AT LEAST THREE THAT I KNOW OF BY "THE ADVOCATE", the one-time catholic weekly of Melbourne, to directly link the Holy Father with spurious teachings to say the least. And where they could not directly implicate the Holy Father, the Modernists - as we all know only too well - have made innumerable attempts to make out THAT THEIR TEACHING IS THE OFFICIAL TEACHING OF THE CHURCH. Let us analyse some of their more glaring attempts, starting with the THREE incidents in THE ADVOCATE.

1. In the issue of July 6, 1972, there appeared a review of a book on Original Sin. The book was written by Fr. Henri RONDET, the review by Fr. J. P. KENNY S.J. Apart from the fact that the erroneous tenets of both the book and the review run counter to TRENT (Denz. 1511), Holy Scripture (Rom. v, 12) and TRADITION echoed by Pope PAUL, the erroneous implication made here for all readers to accept is that a personal sin of Adam is NOT revealed truth, is not defined truth, can be relegated to oblivion and is still subject to dispute and argument. The tone of the review is such that the official teaching of the Church is held up to contempt and ridicule. Here is a quote from it:

"Rondet is a positive scholar, certainly not a creative thinker of the calibre of RAHNER, TEILHARD DE CHARDIN or CONGAR. Something much bolder than Rondet's rather timorous and backward-looking attempt is needed if a theologian IS GOING TO REFORMULATE THE DOGMA OF ORIGINAL SIN (where did we hear that phrase before?) along the lines mapped out by Vatican II OR POPE PAUL." (And then follows a speech by Pope PAUL which, as can be expected, has nothing whatsoever to do with the reformulation of the dogma of original sin).

To quote the Holy Father here as being on the side of the heresies of Teilhard is a gratuitous insult and should not have been allowed to happen by T.A. or Dr. KNOX. So, to settle the argument, let us quote what the Holy Father DID SAY about Original Sin in His famous (but never quoted) "CREDO OF THE PEOPLE OF GOD": (which of course should have been done by the Archbishop as soon as this rubbish appeared in his paper):

THE FALL. We believe that in Adam all have sinned, which means that the original offence committed by HIM caused human nature, common to all, to fall to a state in which it bears the consequences of that offence and which is not the state in which it was first in our first parents, established as they were in holiness and justice and in which man knew neither evil nor death. It is human nature so fallen, stripped of the grace that clothed it, injured in its own natural powers and subjected to the dominion of death, that is transmitted to all men and it is in this sense that every man is born in sin.

All of this is utterly rejected by TEILHARD and anyone, like Fr. KENNY, who advocates polygenism. We must not forget that it was this same Fr. KENNY who

wrote the paper on INTERCOMMUNION, who teaches the candidates for the Priesthood in the Catholic College in CLAYTON his erroneous ideas on the Catholic Priesthood and he is also the one who teaches the tracts on INCARNATION and MARY'S ASSUMPTION, of which Card. SEPER wrote that they are ESTABLISHED TRUTHS. He has the above reviewed book of RONDET on his booklist for his students. Why reveal this man's identity? Because only a few days ago I served the Mass of one of his "products". A young Priest straight from seminary, awaiting his first appointment. AND THIS YOUNG MAN HAD OBLITTERATED FROM HIS MASS NOT ONLY EVERY REFERENCE TO SIN BUT THE ACTUAL WORD "SIN". Except in the words of the Consecration.

Let us call to mind our SINS, became a complete fabrication of his own.

In your mercy keep us free from sin, became free from selfishness.

Look not on our sins but on the faith of your Church, became again: look not on our selfishness

But the worst example of his absolute unbelief in SIN came when he had to show the Host and say: THIS IS THE LAMB OF GOD WHO TAKES AWAY THE SINS OF THE WORLD. This he changed into his own fabrication: THIS IS JESUS CHRIST WHO GIVES US HIS SPIRIT. Happy are they, etc.

This is what happens when Teilhard de Chardin followers are allowed free reign not only to introduce the ideas of VAJTA, the LUTHERAN ASSEMBLY, the WORLD CONGRESS OF THEOLOGIANS into the Catholic Church, BUT TO TEACH IT AND TO MAKE OUT THAT IT IS THE OFFICIAL TEACHING OF THE CHURCH. In order that a poor, unsuspecting seminarian LOSES HIS FAITH IN THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS, he must first lose his belief in SIN, which will follow NATURALLY FROM THE REJECTION OF THE DOGMA OF ORIGINAL SIN, called by Teilhard nothing more startling than a mistake in selecting the right expression, at <sup>their</sup> stage of development in evolution, of a certain group of people.

In this Mass, the hidden schism came into the open. Pope Paul has absolutely forbidden any changes in the format of the New Missal. These people take NO NOTICE. Card. SEPER could have saved his breath and his paper. And if bishops do not take notice and do not take action, a future anti-pope will have no difficulty in showing that this type of teaching was already allowed to flourish under Pope PAUL.....

So here is the first example, the classic example, of how the modernist work under the very nose of the Hierarchy: make out that the Holy Father or the Church is already on their side and boldly proclaim approval. If nobody objects.....

2. Now that we have seen the method in action, let us take a look at another example. In the ADVOCATE of JAN. 27, 1972, there appeared an article under the heading: "PRIEST'S RED CHINA VIEWS DISMAY TAIWAN CLERGY". In it we read that Fr. MEI, 68, has called for the recognition of the position of bishops unlawfully consecrated in Communist China. "While in Rome, Fr. MEI said that 5 years ago Pope PAUL had privately expressed strong reservations ABOUT THE INDISCRIMINATE RECOGNITION of illegally consecrated bishops without examination of individual cases".

This is spurious, mischievous reporting and should have been verified. Fr. MEI makes out as if Pope PAUL's 'reservation' is one of degree and could be bought if the price was right. Spreading this sort of report about Pope PAUL and see it cause no ripple, will make it very easy for an anti-pope later on to recognize apostate bishops and unholy 'Masses'. *[am convinced that Pope PAUL won't have a bar of indiscriminate recognition. Only communists would like to see their puppets recognised in* *front of the world and to force their will on the catholics.*



3. A very important notion nowadays is PLURALISM. The modernists would love to see the principle of pluralism in doctrine adopted. It would make every 'christian' a catholic and we would have unity. So the Holy Father is very definite about the use of this word. But, again, he appears to be the only one, at least in public pronouncements.

In T.A. of OCT. 7, 1971, we read in an article: "FEARS SUBSIDE AT CATECHETICS TALKS" the following statement:

"The exchange of ideas and experiences made it clear that BOTH ROME and the National Hierarchies regard pluralism not as a temporary phenomenon to be overcome, BUT AS THE VERY FOUNDATION OF CATHOLICISM."

Is ROME here the Holy Father? Does Pope PAUL really believe this meaning of pluralism? Why did not he say so then when he spoke about it? The appearance has again been created that the Holy Father is on the side of modern ideas and with a little push can be made to appear to teach that pluralism lies at the foundation of catholic Faith. Because Catholic Faith lies at the foundation of Catholicism. And so the sentence in the quote above is very misleading, since the Pope rejects any use of the word pluralism at the foundation of Catholic Faith. What did the Pope REALLY say, when he spoke about PLURALISM in Sydney, DEC. 1970:

"One may ask: Is pluralism admitted? Yes, but the significance of this word must be well understood. It must ON NO ACCOUNT contradict the substantial unity of christianity. Some of the dangers that lie hidden in pluralism occur when it is not limited TO THE CONTINGENT FORMS OF RELIGIOUS LIFE, but presumes to authorise individual and arbitrary interpretations of Catholic Dogma. Or when it prescind IN THEOLOGICAL study FROM AUTHENTIC TRADITION."

"Contingent forms of religious life" is something completely different from "the very foundation of catholicism". If we only had the quotation of THE ADVOCATE to go by, how would we be able to distinguish a possible anti-pope if he also taught, as ROME AND THE HIERARCHIES already do, that pluralism DOES lie at the foundation of catholicism, and this time means: at the foundation of catholic faith? He would then definitely contradict Pope PAUL's teaching, but what if nobody quotes Pope PAUL's teaching?

And so the struggle for the mind of the Pope, the mind of the Church goes on, unceasingly, unrelentingly, day and night: the modernists all the time claiming to have both on their side with all the powerful means of propaganda at their disposal. Preparing for the day WHEN A POPE OF THEIR OWN MAKING WILL APPROVE OF THE CHURCH OF THEIR OWN MAKING, TEACHING THE DOCTRINE OF THEIR OWN MAKING....

In conclusion it would now suffice to just quote a few pet doctrines of the modernists, which they would love to see adopted by the Universal Church. NONE of the following have ever been touched by a Successor of PETER, so if a future one does, watch out and listen very attentively.

- They want to see the "substantial agreement" between Anglican and Roman Catholic theologians on the Blessed Eucharist and Holy Orders ratified.
- They want to see this extended to all other communion services through the ONE COMMUNION SERVICE FOR UNIVERSAL USE with recognition of each other's ministers to 'effect the Eucharist'.
- In this respect they want the words of the Consecration 'updated' so that a eucharist without Transubstantiation will become the new centre of unity acceptable to all. A simple memorial service....
- They want the Papacy EFFECTIVELY limited through collegiality as the new principle of decision making.
- They want the Decrees against TEILHARD and his inspired teaching revoked.

- In order to have their longed-for Council of Reconciliation in Jerusalem where ALL christians can participate in true ecumenical fashion and whose decrees will then be binding on all, they will then teach that they have effected the reunion of all christendom BASED ON LOVE, against the 1928 encyclical of Pope PIUS XI "MORTALIUM ANIMOS".
- On the moral side they want a cautious introduction of birthcontrol and optional celibacy and a lot of other freedoms based on individual consciences.
- They want the principle of PLURALISM IN DOCTRINE accepted.

Since Modernism is essentially the religion of reason and no longer of believing in revealed, defined Truths, and since all the points mentioned above (and many more) sound so 'reasonable' many who have lost their catholic Faith, or who have lost the LOVE FOR THEIR CATHOLIC FAITH and so a knowledge of it, and who no longer care "one way or the other", such people will no longer be in a position to distinguish a TRUE SUCCESSOR OF PETER from a possible FALSE one. And so they will drift along. In a vague sort of a way 'they have heard it all before', somewhere, some time, and so it is probably good.....

"To the rest of you I say: do what the Elders tell you and wrap yourselves in humility to be servants of each other, because God refuses the proud and will always favour the humble. Bow down then before the power of God now and He will raise you up on the appointed day; unload all your worries on Him since He is looking after you. BE CALM BUT VIGILANT, because your enemy the devil is prowling around like a roaring lion looking for someone to eat. STAND UP TO HIM, strong in Faith and in the knowledge THAT YOUR BROTHERS ALL OVER THE WORLD ARE SUFFERING THE SAME THINGS. You will have to suffer only for a little while: the God of all grace who called you to eternal glory in Christ will see that all is well again. He will confirm, strengthen and support you. His power lasts for ever and ever. Amen. "

PETER.



encyclical of Pope PIUS XI "MORTALIUM ANIMOS".

- On the moral side they want a cautious introduction of birthcontrol and optional celibacy and a lot of other freedoms based on individual consciences.
- They want the principle of PLURALISM IN DOCTRINE accepted.

Since Modernism is essentially the religion of reason and no longer of believing in revealed, defined Truths, and since all the points mentioned above (and many more) sound so 'reasonable' many who have lost their catholic Faith, or who have lost the LOVE FOR THEIR CATHOLIC FAITH and so a knowledge of it, and who no longer care "one way or the other", such people will no longer be in a position to distinguish a TRUE SUCCESSOR OF PETER from a possible FALSE one. And so they will drift along. In a vague sort of a way 'they have heard it all before', somewhere, some time, and so it is probably good.....

"To the rest of you I say: do what the Elders tell you and wrap yourselves in humility to be servants of each other, because God refuses the proud and will always favour the humble. Bow down then before the power of God now and He will raise you up on the appointed day; unload all your worries on Him since He is looking after you. BE CALM BUT VIGILANT, because your enemy the devil is prowling around like a roaring lion looking for someone to eat. STAND UP TO HIM, strong in Faith and in the knowledge THAT YOUR BROTHERS ALL OVER THE WORLD ARE SUFFERING THE SAME THINGS. You will have to suffer only for a little while: the God of all grace who called you to eternal glory in Christ will see that all is well again. He will confirm, strengthen and support you. His power lasts for ever and ever. Amen."

PETER.

EPIPHANY 1975

WYNDHAM ST.  
DRYSDALE 3222