



Can a Loyal Catholic Love the Pope and Oppose Vatican II?

Can a loyal Catholic love the Pope and oppose Vatican II? Many thousands, if not millions, do. But how can this be? Wasn't the Second Vatican Council an ecumenical council of the Catholic Church? Was it not convened by two Popes? Weren't the present Holy Father, Benedict XVI and the late Pope John Paul II, among its architects and leading lights? Haven't these Popes constantly praised the work of Vatican II? Aren't its teachings therefore infallible, and not subject to question or criticism by any loyal Catholic who loves the Pope? The answers to these five questions are, respectively, yes, yes, yes, yes, and no. Since I presume the reader to be in agreement with the first four answers, let's concentrate on the last one.

While the answer I have given to the question of the infallibility (or lack thereof) of the Second Vatican Council (hereinafter "V2") may seem flippant, ignorant, irresponsible, or even heretical at first glance, it is an irrefutable historical fact that V2 was *specifically limited by both Popes* who convened it, John XXIII and Paul VI, to what were termed "*pastoral*" matters ¹. Unlike a Dogmatic Council (such as Trent, Vatican I, and nearly every other Ecumenical Council ² in history), *no dogmas were to be defined*, and *no heresies were to be condemned* in this "Pastoral Council". So rigidly was this directive carried out, that when traditionally-oriented prelates in attendance at the Council complained to the Liberal/Modernist clique who had seized, by unscrupulous parliamentary maneuvers, the chairmanships of the committees³, of the ambiguous terms and lack of definitions in the Council documents, they were assured that no definitions or precision were needed because V2 was only a Pastoral, non-dogmatic council⁴. The Liberal/Modernist leaders, some of whose writings had been condemned as heretical by previous Popes, but who were favored by John XXIII and Paul VI, having thus neutralized the conservative Fathers, took a different position *following* the Council, however. When the Council was over, a new attitude, unlike any previously seen in Church history, and spearheaded by the Modernist clique, swept throughout the Church like a tidal wave. The pastoral V2 was suddenly (though unofficially!) dubbed the "new Pentecost", and all the dogmatic teachings of all Councils preceding it were treated as "outdated ecclesiology", and superseded by the teachings of what they (including the late Pope John Paul II) termed the "Conciliar Church", as if in recognition of the fact that the new teachings *could not be reconciled* with the *previous* constant Teachings of the Holy Catholic Church, henceforth to be recast as the "Pre-Conciliar" Church. Old catechisms, with their precise definitions, were summarily discarded and replaced with new ones that were ambiguous and incomplete at best, or heretical at worst. A new banalized, vernacularized form of liturgy, concocted by a committee including Protestant ministers and a Jew, under the direction of a prelate later proven to be a Freemason⁵, and designed primarily for the purpose of being man-centered, and inoffensive to non-Catholics, was forcibly imposed

1 The texts of the addresses of Popes John XXIII and Paul VI given at their respective convenings of the Council can be found in collections of the Documents of Vatican II.

2 The fifth Ecumenical Council, the second of Constantinople, in 553, also caused mass confusion in the Church due to its ambiguities concerning the Monophysite heresy. For details, see *The Great Façade* by Ferrara and Woods, p.326ff.

3 See *The Rhine Flows into the Tiber* by Ralph Wiltgen

4 Eyewitness testimony of this was given, for instance, in *I Accuse the Council*, by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre.

5 Archbishop Annibale Bugnini.

upon a bewildered clergy and laity in place of the ancient and venerable Latin Mass. Sanctuaries and their precious marble altars were quickly jackhammered to rubble, beautiful statues that had inspired generations with love of God and His Saints were smashed and carted to dumps, beautiful altar rails were ripped out, priceless stained-glass windows were destroyed, gold vessels that had contained the Body and Blood of Our Lord were sold to be melted down into jewelry⁶ or used for other profane purposes, etc., all to make way for “new improved” sanctuaries more appropriate for the new “Mass”. Barren, vulgar, ugly churches were thus prepared for the barren, vulgar, ugly new liturgy. Priests ordained to re-enact the Sacrifice of Calvary upon the Altar for the remission of sins found themselves demoted to the ambiguous position of “president of the assembly”, a kind of toastmaster/ entertainer, and not very good ones at that. This was all in the name of relevance and updating. Many parishioners found it so “relevant” that they went away, never to return, many abandoning the true Faith altogether for Protestant sects or a life of materialism. Priests and religious abandoned their callings in throngs. Seminaries that had been filled were closed down. People who remained in the pews to watch this sorry spectacle began to have their Faith eroded by heterodox sermons and catechesis, and a watered-down liturgy that no longer expressed clearly what it was to be a Catholic (which word was being replaced with the less-precise word “Christian”). Missionary activity, which existed to fulfill the Church’s Divine Mandate to preach the Gospel to every nation and baptize all souls into the one Saving Faith, was replaced materially with secular social work, and spiritually with “ecumenism”, an undefined man-made attitude that seems to “feel” that the gradual watering-down of the meanings of doctrines can sufficiently obliterate the difference between Truth and Error, that all mankind can get along in “peace” without having to change anyone’s beliefs. Indeed, in practice, Jews, Orthodox, Muslims, and Protestants are now in many cases actively discouraged, by missionaries⁷, priests, and even the Vatican itself, from converting to the Catholic Faith. The Church’s God-given mandate is now held to be “outdated ecclesiology”, and conversion is eschewed in favor of something called “Convergence”. The Vatican hierarchy, since the Council, now considers it more charitable to leave non-Catholics in their sins and errors, than to risk hurting their feelings with the news that their false religions cannot save them from hell. And we have witnessed, in the pontificate of John Paul II, the unprecedented spectacle of the Holy Father himself telling the Muslims that they worship the same God that we do (as if their savage unitarian “Allah” could have anything to do with the Most Blessed Trinity), and publicly kissing their blasphemous Koran (which teaches Muslims that Christians are infidels and to “kill them wherever you find them”). The magnitude of the crime of abandoning the Muslims to their errors instead of sending missionaries to convert them can be glimpsed by recalling the presence of copies of the Koran among the personal effects of the hijackers who crashed the planes into the World Trade Center in 2001. Would that crime have been prevented by missionaries reaching out to bring them the light of the Holy Gospel? We will not know in this life, but would anyone want to be held responsible on Judgment Day for such a failure? “Love thy neighbor as thyself” and “Teach all nations” is quite a bit different from “kill them wherever you find them”! False beliefs have serious consequences, and the abandonment of Catholic missionary activity that seeks conversion to the one True Faith is nothing short of criminal.

Some who call themselves Catholics see the calamities listed above as somehow “positive”. They feel that the empty seminaries and priest-less parishes and widespread acceptance of gross immorality among Catholics are positive signs of a new improved church evolving, in which there is no longer any such thing as sin, and anything that makes you feel warm and fuzzy is OK. These are the liberal/modernists, who see their plans coming to fruition, as they intended by their hijacking of Vatican II in its first days. Then there are the “traditional Catholics”, who also recognize the grim success of this strategy, and who, for love of the Church and of the Holy Father, do everything possible to oppose it.

6 The exquisite chalice of Pope St. Pius X narrowly escaped this very fate when it was ransomed by a traditional priest.

7 Shocking as it may seem, even the late Mother Teresa of Calcutta, under the influence of this pernicious novelty, is known to have discouraged non-Catholics from joining the Church founded by Our Lord. What is missionary work *for*, if not to win converts for Christ’s Church?

Then there are those who, while understanding that some of the fruits of V2 are a problem, nevertheless refuse to see the connection between them and the Council that unleashed them, in spite of the fact that they were unleashed during and after the Council, and the fact that the Council was everywhere cited as the justification for them by the radical prelates who framed the Council's documents. "The Council was misunderstood and still needs to be implemented properly", they say, including, as of this writing, our new Pope Benedict XVI. Misunderstood by whom? The Popes? The late Pope John Paul II declared that V2 was a great success! And it was, for those who were deliberately subverting the Church. If V2 has been misunderstood, it is by those who blindly assert, in the face of a tidal wave of proofs to the contrary, that V2 was completely in harmony with all Catholic teaching that came before it. Or they will tell us, "the fact that these problems *followed* Vatican II does not prove Vatican II was the *cause* of them" Taken by itself, the argument is valid. But, taken by itself, *neither* can it be used to prove that V2 was *not* the cause! Ask those doing the damage where they get their authority, and they will cite V2. When the Popes of V2 were asked why they would not stop it, they, too, would cite V2. Ask why heretics can preach lies from the pulpits and teach error to seminarians and abuse altar boys for decades with impunity, but a faithful priest will be disciplined *immediately* for something as harmless as publicly celebrating the traditional Latin Mass, or repeating words spoken by Our Lady at Fatima, and you will hear a citation from V2.

The documents of Vatican II were very carefully crafted so that they could be interpreted in a Catholic way, so as to insulate their authors from charges of formal heresy. But they were *also* so crafted as to permit any interpretation that the liberal/modernists (who wrote them) might choose to give them, and filled with plenty of "wobble-room" to give the radicals all they needed to play havoc in the Church. And from this standpoint, I, for one, will give the framers of V2 credit for a smashing success. But I also insist that, by now, it should be self-evident to all with eyes and ears that the Second Vatican Council is, in itself, an unmitigated catastrophe for Holy Mother Church, and the sooner it can be reversed, the better for all mankind.

As to how the Holy Ghost could allow such a calamity to befall the Mystical Body of Christ, may I bring to the reader's recollection the calamity that was permitted to befall the *physical* Body of Christ, that He was betrayed and abandoned *by His own Apostles*, abused beyond recognition *by His own High Priests*, and turned over by them to the pagan secular authorities for an ignominious execution? All this He bore to take on Himself the punishment for the sins of His People. I suggest that V2 is not the new Pentecost, but the new Wednesday in Holy Week, namely, *the day of betrayal of the Mystical Body of Christ into the hands of Her enemies, by Her own Apostles*, culminating in a veritable scourging and crucifixion now being visited upon Her for the sins of Catholics, who have not been leavening the world as we should, but have let *ourselves* be leavened by *it*. If this be the case, perhaps the last three Popes of V2⁸ can be seen as the three denials of a scared Apostle trying desperately to distance himself from the Church's past, which is not "politically correct" in our unbelieving neo-pagan era. Our duty as "traditionalists" is to stand at the Foot of the Cross, with Our Lady and "St. John" (faithful Catholics and priests faithful to the traditional Liturgy), even if "Peter" still seems to be off warming himself at the fires of the pagans, and pray for his return to his post. As of this writing (June 2005) the signals being sent by Pope Benedict are very mixed. Please join the growing number of concerned Catholics who love the Church and the Holy Father enough to pray that Peter's tears of repentance may be upon Pope Benedict XVI, and that he will abandon what can most charitably be described as a failed experiment. With sufficient prayer and penance, anything is possible, for all things are possible with God. And in the meantime, we also await ...*the Resurrection*.

David Melechinsky, P.O. Box 73, St. Mary's, KS 66536 U.S.A.
Phone/Fax 785-437-2072; e-mail: graphics73@yahoo.com.

8 John XXIII, Paul VI, and John Paul II, each of whom pointedly distanced himself from one or more aspects of Catholic Tradition he perceived to be not in keeping with modern ideas.