

HE IS RISEN!

THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL

PASTORAL CONSTITUTION ON THE CHURCH
IN THE MODERN WORLD

GAUDIUM ET SPES
(7 December 1965)

Part two, Chapter V :
THE FOSTERING OF PEACE
AND THE PROMOTION OF A COMMUNITY OF NATIONS

« The New City is not to be built on hazy notions », it exists, St. Pius X said, « it is the Catholic City ». It only has to be « set up and restored continually: Omnia instaurare in Christo! » Furthermore, since the events of Fatima we know that God has entrusted « *the fostering of peace* » to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. This “divine politics” is a mystery that we must have in mind as we continue reading *Gaudium et spes*, the fifth chapter of which is a kind of insolent retort to St. Pius X.

INTRODUCTION.

77. § 1. « *In our generation when men continue to be afflicted (still! Despite *Gaudium et spes*, despite « joy and hope ») by acute hardships and anxieties [ærumnæ et angustia] arising from the ravages of war or the threat of it, the whole human family faces an hour of supreme crisis in its advance toward maturity (you might as well say revolution!). Moving gradually together (Where? How? Why? Is this family no longer scattered all over the world?) and everywhere more conscious already of its unity (whatever is a collective conscience of the whole of mankind?), this family cannot accomplish its task of constructing for all men everywhere (in Greenland, in Tibet, in Sri Lanka, everywhere, and irrespective of the prevailing religion or irreligion) a world more genuinely human unless each person devotes himself to the cause (of what? Of whom? Of Christ? No! Rather, it is one) of peace with renewed purpose of conversion (it is thus a new-style conversion in comparison with what was called “conversion” before the Council). »*

Such is the « *new [antichrist] humanism* » that Paul VI proclaimed in Saint Peter’s in his Closing Address to the Council on 7 December 1965, the day of *Gaudium et spes*’ solemn promulgation. Since then, war is everywhere. This is not surprising because the « *unity* » in question is not that of Christ, a unity respectful of nations and natural communities under the aegis of the Church. Rather, it is the unity of « *the whole human family* », which, for its part, is not, as such, under the authority of Christ and the Church; it is divided into those who are under the authority of Christ and the Church and those who do refuse to obey them. The latter are under the authority... of whom? Who else, the Prince of this world. Admittedly, he is absent from *Gaudium et spes*, but that does not prevent him from ruling. Quite to the contrary! Since there was no warning against him, - right from his Opening Address, John XXIII had indeed decided that the Second Vatican Council would not have to fulminate anathemas -, there he was « *released from his prison* » (Ap 20. 7), « *the one who restrains [...] gotten out of the way* » (cf. 2 Th 2:6-7). As for the Virgin Mary, She who crushes the Serpent’s head, the Pope also has « *gotten* » Her « *out of the way* » by paying no heed to Her message. In the midst of World War I, this Message warned us that souls would avoid Hell and peace come the world by means of devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary.

« *Thus it happens that the Gospel message, which is in harmony with the loftier strivings and aspirations of the human race (the latter of which are not embodied in the Church but in the UN, according to Paul VI’s address delivered before this assembly in New York on 4 October 1965: « This is the finest aspect of the United Nations Organisation, this is what gives it its most genuinely human guise; this is the ideal that mankind has dreamed of. »), takes on a new lustre in our day as it declares that the artisans of peace are blessed “because they will be called the sons of God” (Mt 5:9). »*

This is what St. Pius X called « *blasphemous comparisons between the Gospel and the Revolution* ».

In order for « *artisans of peace* » to be called « *sons of God* » we must be Mary’s docile children... Otherwise, everyone will wage war against everyone else, as we see is the case since the closing of the Council.

§ 2 « *Consequently, as it points out the authentic and noble meaning of peace and condemns the frightfulness of war (this would be the only condemnation pronounced by the Council!), the Council wishes passionately to summon Christians to cooperate, under the help of Christ the author of peace, with all men in securing among themselves a peace based on justice and love and in setting up the instruments of peace. »*

Does it mean that every war is « *frightful* », even if it is waged by our *paras* and our alpine *chasseurs* against the Taliban? Yes, it does in the opinion of the Council, which ends up abolishing any distinction between brigands and the forces of order by proclaiming « *the transcendent dignity of the human person* ». As a result, however, it is the Good God who is condemned, He who allows war as a chastisement for our infidelities and as a natural state of sinful peoples.

Whatever is « *the authentic and noble meaning of peace* » according to the Council? The following paragraph sets it forth:

THE NATURE OF PEACE.

78. § 1. « *Peace is not merely the absence of war; nor can it be reduced solely to the maintenance of a balance of power between enemies; nor is it brought about by dictatorship. Instead, it is rightly and appropriately called an "enterprise of justice" (Is 32, 17). Peace results from that order structured into human society by its divine Founder, and actualised by men as they thirst after ever greater justice. The common good of humanity finds its ultimate meaning in the eternal law. But since the concrete demands of this common good are constantly changing as time goes on, peace is never attained once and for all, but must be built up ceaselessly. Moreover, since the human will is unsteady and wounded by sin, the achievement of peace requires a constant mastering of passions and the vigilance of lawful authority.* »

It is clear that this « *vigilance of lawful authority* » must have an army at its disposal in order not to be pointless. This is precisely why popular wisdom, far from thoughtlessly condemning war, advocates rather that one should prepare for it: « *If you want peace, prepare for war.* » No people is exempted from meeting this condition for its survival.

Our Father explains it brilliantly:

« Every organised society tends to reserve to those who govern it the care for internal security, for law and order, which are its heart and arm, as it does for the legislative power, which is its brain. In the same, every organised society entrusts to those who govern it the responsibility for maintaining independence, that is its security with regard to foreign societies, neighbours, rivals or enemies. The right to wage war pertains to the legitimate Power, whose duty it is to safeguard the existence, moral and material rights of any sovereign society. »

How can this « *legitimate Power* » be defined, and how can the limits of its exercise be determined?

« Whatever the history of human groups, all show at any given moment, at the level of the family, the tribe, the nation or the Empire, a limit or a frontier defining their organised community around their sovereign Power. **Within this limit, Peace is a work of Justice; outside this limit, Peace is a work of Force.** Within this boundary, that is to say in matters of individual crimes, injustice and sedition, the central Power, through its proportionate intervention, will repress, judge and sanction these because it has supreme, undisputed, powerful tribunal institutions at its disposal.

« But beyond these frontiers of sovereignty, and at the present time that means beyond every political community governed by a sovereign state, there are no institutions of higher justice, at least not yet, capable of annulling and appeasing disputes, contestations and aggressions. The historian may refer nostalgically to Christendom as it once was; the moralist may wish for a supranational institution of justice and peace to exist at last; the theologian may propose Rome as the source and centre of a universal law and superior power for peace... Nevertheless, it has to be recognised that at certain periods of history, such as ours, sovereign states are national - and that in itself is a remarkable progress on tribal society! and much better than class warfare! » (*The church, war and the death penalty*, CCR n° 84, March 1977, p.9)

The Council, however, only recognises individuals, i.e., « *human persons* » without family, country, or religion..., and who long for peace. How can it be achieved?

Here is the Council's answer:

§ 2. « *But this is not enough. This peace on earth cannot be obtained unless personal well-being is safeguarded and men freely and trustingly share with one another the riches of their inner spirits and their talents. A firm determination to respect other men and peoples and their dignity, as well as the studied practice of brotherhood are absolutely necessary for the establishment of peace. Hence peace is likewise the fruit of love, which goes beyond what justice can provide.* »

Yes, but what sort of love? « *Two kinds of love have built two Cities* », we have known it since the time of St. Augustine. « *the love of self to the contempt of God* » is the law of the City of which Satan is the Prince. « *the love of God to the contempt of self* » is the law of the City of God.

This is precisely the reason why throughout the centuries of Christendom the Church alone was a factor of peace and concord among peoples; her preaching « *was the most powerful restraint on the passions of men, which cause wars and revolutions. Whoever follows the principles of the Gospel and the morality of the Church, without concession to revolutionary ideas, necessarily participates in the peace and order of the world, not in words and demands, but in wisdom and service. That is how the traditional maxim *Opus justitiae pax* (Is 32, 17, quoted above, *Gaudium et spes*, 78. 1) is to be understood. Not in the revolutionary sense, which is now in vogue, whereby the world must go through fire and blood so that "*justice*" be everywhere established and only then can there be peace. But in the obvious sense that those who observe justice in their own lives are by that very fact already working for the maintenance and restoration of peace.* » (Point n° 68)

§ 3. « *That earthly peace which arises from love of neighbour symbolises and results from the peace of Christ which radiates from God the Father. For by the Cross the incarnate Son, the Prince of peace reconciled all men with God. By thus restoring all men to the unity of one people and one body, He slew hatred in His own flesh; and, after being lifted on high by His resurrection, He poured forth the Spirit of love into the hearts of men.* »

§ 4. « *For this reason, all Christians are urgently summoned to do in love what the truth requires, and to join with all true peacemakers in pleading for peace and bringing it about.* »

The mind boggles! If Jesus Christ really « *slew hatred in His own flesh* », He revived it when He raised His own flesh! For hatred has not ceased sowing « *the acute hardships and anxieties* » of war, especially today. Just one word is missing from this paragraph for it to be in the right, the word "Church": « *For by the Cross the incarnate Son, the Prince of peace reconciled all men with God. He thus restored all men to the unity of one People and one Body* »... in the Church. Outside the Church, there is neither peace nor salvation because there is no « *Spirit of love in the hearts of men* ».

Today, in our Apocalyptic times, the Immaculate Heart of Mary is the personification of the Church. The Council, however, pays no heed to this.

§ 5. « *Motivated by this same spirit, we cannot fail to praise those who renounce the use of violence* (this expression includes any recourse to the use of force in human conflicts; in other words, « *peace-loving people* » are "pacifists") *in the vindication* (of what? Of their family? Of their country? No, rather) *of their rights* (which ones? The rights of man, obviously!) *and who resort to methods of*

defence which are otherwise available to weaker parties too (for example, hunger strikes. This is how the « weak » are incited to resort to extreme measures in order to draw the attention of the « strong », who, for their part, do not hesitate to shed blood to fight against... hunger in the world or in favour of democracy), *provided this can be done without injury to the rights and duties of others or of the community itself.* »

Here, the error consists of considering peace not as the work of might but of right. All periods of peace throughout history were, on the contrary, the result of triumphant force.

Here, the Council becomes, alongside its worse enemies, the propagandist of a universal, unconditional, demobilising, disarming pacifism. The only ones who benefit are « *the less utopian exploiters of the people* », as St. Pius X used to say (*Letter on the Sillon*, n° 38). For, according to the Catholic Faith, which gives the correct interpretation of the words of the Son of God, « war is a *crime* to be guarded against, but at the same time it is a *scourge* for which we must be forearmed and sometimes forestall and surmount, if necessary, with arms as necessitated by legitimate defence, help of one's neighbour, the law of nations and the law of God. » (*Against the war*, CCR n° 129, December 1980)

§ 6. « *Insofar as men are sinful, the threat of war hangs over them, and hang over them it will until the return of Christ* (the return to reality is ... short-lived). *But insofar as men vanquish sin by a union of love* (question: yes or no, are men still sinners?), *they will vanquish violence* (by force, if necessary) *as well and make these words come true: "They shall turn their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into sickles. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more" (Is 2:4).* »

While awaiting the happy time when men will no longer be sinners, the Church should therefore always admit legitimate self-defence and bless armies that guarantee it. Instead of doing so, the men of the Church repeat today the absurd principles that caused the extermination of the Moravian brethren in the sixteenth century - « *If you want peace, prepare peace* »; « *peace through development* »; « *no more war ever again !* »

« Again, it is the intrepid Pope of peace, St. Pius X, who delivers us from this unworthy conduct and from these deceptive words. In his *Letter on the Sillon*, he taught French Catholics the virtue of the true Christian pacific spirit, consisting not in dreams of impossible perfection here below, but in accepting with a great spirit of faith the trials, injustices and violence against which there is no possible remedy without compromising the great good of peace. And he added that if the peoples would accept such moral teaching from Christ and from the Church, then a *utopia* of concord among peoples and of universal peace would become, through the grace of Christ only Lord of the nation, the mark of God's Kingdom come on earth. » (*ibid.*)

SECTION 1 THE AVOIDANCE OF WAR

TO LIMIT THE INHUMANITY OF WARS.

In 1962, on the eve of the Council, a secret agreement was concluded between the Vatican and Moscow. Russian observers would go to the Council, at John XXIII's invitation, on one condition: the Council would commit itself not to condemn Communism. « The greatest Council of all time (as it called itself) remained deaf and blind to the greatest phenomenon of inhumanity of all time: the world expansion of Bolshevism. And silently lent it decisive aid. » (Georges de Nantes, "*The Church by Soviet time*", CCR n° 111, June 1979) This whole chapter of *Gaudium et spes* ought to be read in the light of this monstrous betrayal.

79. § 1. « *Even though recent wars have wrought physical and moral havoc on our world, the devastation of battle still goes on day by day in some part of the world.*

« *Indeed, now that every kind of weapon produced by modern science is used in war, the fierce character of warfare threatens to lead the combatants to a savagery far surpassing that of the past.* »

Already, while World War I was being waged, Our Lady announced that if people did not cease offending God, « a worse one » would break out in the reign of Pius XI.

« *Furthermore, the complexity of the modern world and the intricacy of international relations allow guerrilla warfare to be drawn out* (for example in the Middle East) *by new methods of deceit and subversion. In many cases the use of terrorism is regarded as a new way to wage war.* »

It is the resolve not to condemn Communism that explains here the veil drawn over « *the complexity of the modern world and the intricacy of international relations* ». They could easily be untangled if men would deign to heed the « Secret » that Our Lady entrusted to Her little seers on 13 July 1917:

« *If My requests are heeded, Russia will be converted and there will be peace. If not, she will spread her errors throughout the world, provoking wars and persecutions against the Church.* » By all possible means, even « *the use of terrorism* ».

§ 2. « *Contemplating this melancholy state of humanity, the Council wishes, above all things else, to recall the permanent binding force of the universal natural law and its all-embracing principles.* »

In order to gauge the hypocrisy of this text, it suffices to evoke the non-aggression pact that we have just recalled and that binds its authors to the savage imperialism of the Communist powers!

Now, for good measure, comes the apology for the "resistance", for which Communists are the heralds:

« *Man's conscience itself* (the Council appeals to a collective conscience rather than to God's Law!) *gives ever more emphatic voice* (through the agency of the Council, the echo of « *mankind's conscience itself* » and not of God's will) *to these principles. Therefore, actions which deliberately conflict with these same principles, as well as orders commanding such actions are criminal, and blind obedience cannot excuse those who yield to them. The most infamous among these are actions designed for the methodical extermination of an entire people, nation or ethnic minority* (for example, Armenians who were exterminated by Turks in 1894-1896 and in 1914-1916). *Such actions must be vehemently condemned as horrendous crimes* (Benedict XVI did not breathe a word concerning the Armenian genocide during his trip to Turkey in 2006). *The courage of those who fearlessly and openly resist those who issue such commands merits supreme commendation.*

§ 3. « *On the subject of war, quite a large number of nations have subscribed to international agreements aimed at making military activity and its consequences less inhuman. Their stipulations deal with such matters as the treatment of wounded soldiers and prisoners. Agreements of this sort must be honoured. Indeed they should be improved upon so that the frightfulness of war can be better and more workably held in check. All men, especially government officials and experts in these matters, are bound to do everything they can to effect these improvements.* »

In order to attenuate the horrors of war, the Church instituted the "truce of God" and the rules of chivalry throughout the centuries of Christendom. But modern, contemporary genocides were born of Protestantism as it tore Christendom asunder (1517), of the philosophy of Enlightenment (1717), and of the Bolshevik Revolution (1917).

The Second Vatican Council brought this « revolt of the individual against the species » (Auguste Comte) to its height by recognising conscientious objection. It is a false opposition between "conscience" and the natural duty to defend the historical community to which each "human person" belongs:

« *Moreover, it seems right that laws make humane provisions for the case of those who for reasons of conscience refuse to bear arms, provided however, that they agree to serve the human community in some other way.* »

This text is an incitement to desertion in wartime. Who benefits from it? The NGOs that are in the service of the « *human community* »... which does not exist, as the Council was obliged to recognise it in the following paragraph:

§ 4. « *Certainly, war has not been rooted out of human affairs (how could the situation be different in a world where politicians have no concern for things of God?). As long as the danger of war remains and there is no competent and sufficiently powerful authority at the international level, governments cannot be denied the right to legitimate defence once every means of peaceful settlement has been exhausted.* »

« There can be no question of denying the State this right of legitimate defence, which is recognised to individuals. It has become the State's duty by virtue of a sort of "social pact" that has transferred this defence to it. This function consists in using the police to respond to all unjust aggression and in resoundingly restoring justice. This must be done without restricting power, even to the point of taking lives. For it is absolutely necessary that "law retain its might." » (G. de Nantes, *The church, war and the death penalty*, CCR n° 84)

« *State authorities and others who share public responsibility have the duty to conduct such grave matters soberly and to protect the welfare of the people entrusted to their care.* »

« Consequently, Power is of such high dignity, of such a lofty exercise, that it calls into question such responsibilities and has such consequences that it must be handed over to a Body of the State or to a Person sufficiently endowed with competency, reflexion, and conscience and preserved from any temptation, in order that they not commit great faults other than exceptionally. It is here again a royal office, a "regalian power", and it is unthinkable to hand them over to public opinion, to the masses, to parties and to their successive, contradictory and immoderate passions. » (*ibid.*)

« *But it is one thing to undertake military action for the just defence of the people, and something else again to seek the subjugation of other nations.* »

« How far is a state entitled to cede to the enemy? How far can the conqueror's demands go? Civilised peoples maintain, according to their morality, that to demand unconditional surrender, the total invasion of a country and its total absorption by the conqueror, are crimes. But natural law falls short of such respect for the enemy and even that, alas, is no longer observed by our world, which is becoming worse than barbarous... » (*ibid.*)

That shows how little this moralising Council would be listened to!

« *But it is one thing to undertake military action for the just defence of the people, and something else again to seek the subjugation of other nations. Nor, by the same token, does the mere fact that war has unhappily begun mean that all is fair between the warring parties.* »

« Moral judgement must be constantly exercised in the conduct of war. Having made war a matter of State, civilised states recognise the convention whereby war is waged against the adversary nation and not against the individual citizens of that nation. This convention produces a certain morality of war to be respected equally by both parties, whereby the bombardment of civilian populations, the destruction of the treasures of civilisation and of poor people's implements of livelihood, the massacre of prisoners of war, revenge for reversals suffered and the torturing of those under interrogation are reprovved, etc. » (*ibid.*)

§ 5. « *Those too who devote themselves to the military service of their country should regard themselves as the agents of security and freedom of peoples. As long as they fulfill this role properly, they are making a genuine contribution to the establishment of peace.* »

This frosty praise of the military life of those who devote themselves to the « *security and freedom of peoples* » keeps us far from the religion of the French soldiers of World War I. Their sacrifice associated them with the divine Victim of Calvary, with a view to the redemption of peoples, in particular France, and served as a supreme remedy to her infidelity (cf. CCR n° 272, December 1994).

TOTAL WAR.

80. § 1. « *The horror and perversity of war is immensely magnified by the addition of scientific weapons.* »

The Council is resolutely unaware of military virtues and sees only perversity, not so much in false religions and ideologies that goad warmongers on, as in the weapons used.

« *For acts of war involving these weapons can inflict massive and indiscriminate destruction, thus going far beyond the bounds of legitimate defence. Indeed, if the kind of instruments which can now be found in the armories of the great nations (which ones? The pact sealed with Moscow forbids the Council to name names...) were to be employed to their fullest, an almost total and altogether reciprocal slaughter of each side by the other would follow, not to mention the widespread devastation that would take place in the world and the deadly after effects that would be spawned by the use of weapons of this kind.* »

Here indeed are circumlocutions to avoid naming atomic weapons, by mutual agreement with the American bishops. It would be tactless to broach the subject.

§ 2. « *All these considerations compel us to undertake an evaluation of war with an entirely new attitude.* »

Here, a note refers to John XXIII's encyclical, *Pacem in terris*, in which the Pope extols an ideal, future world to be built on the good will of all men under the pretext that « *in this age which boasts of its atomic power, it no longer makes sense to maintain that war is a fit instrument with which to obtain justice for the violation of rights.* ». John XXIII, however, had read the "Third Secret", in which there is no question of « *atomic power* », contrary to what everyone was expecting, but of « *a group of soldiers who fired bullets and arrows* », akin to the rockets that kill our soldiers in Afghanistan...

« *The men of our time must realise that they will have to give a sombre reckoning of their deeds of war (to whom? To God, on Judgement Day? It goes unsaid) for the course of the future will depend greatly on the decisions they make today.*

§ 3. « *With these truths in mind, this most holy Synod makes its own the condemnations of total war already pronounced by recent popes, and issues the following declaration:*

§ 4. « *Any act of war aimed indiscriminately at the destruction of entire cities of extensive areas along with their population is a crime against God and man himself (that's serious!). It merits unequivocal and unhesitating condemnation.*

§ 5. « *The unique hazard of modern warfare consists in this: it provides those who possess modern scientific weapons with a kind of occasion for perpetrating just such abominations; moreover, through a certain inexorable chain of events, it can catapult men into the most atrocious decisions. That such may never truly happen in the future, the bishops of the whole world gathered together, beg all men, especially government officials and military leaders, to give unremitting thought to their gigantic responsibility before God and the entire human race.* »

The Council has weapons of « *mass destruction* » in its sights, while the "Third Secret" reveals the propagation of « *flames that seemed as though they would set the world on fire* ». The conciliar warning is thus ineffective. The bishops would have more efficiently contributed to peace on earth if they had echoed the cry of the Angel: « *Penance, Penance, Penance!* » It is their personal « *crime against God and man himself* », not to have attached the slightest importance to it.

It is frightening to assess the consequences of this rebellion of the Church's whole hierarchy against the Mother of God; forty years later, there is everywhere on earth a threat of general fire. The vision of the "Third Secret" has warned us about it since its disclosure in the year 2000.

THE ARMS RACE.

81. § 1. « *To be sure, scientific weapons are not amassed solely for use in war. Since the defensive strength of any nation is considered to be dependent upon its capacity for immediate retaliation (another truism), this accumulation of arms, which increases each year, likewise serves, in a way heretofore unknown (sic!), as deterrent to possible enemy attack. Many regard this procedure as the most effective way by which peace of a sort can be maintained between nations at the present time.* »

This is not paradoxical. « *If you want peace, prepare for war* », immemorial popular wisdom teaches. « *As soon as it appears possible to maintain peace, even precariously by means of the stability that terror can create, it is normal for a country that has the means to equip itself with a nuclear deterrence force. Deterrence is a fact that the history of these last years proves true: conflicts between the two blocs have been forced towards external territories and to keep within certain limits.* » (G. de Nantes, *Sommes-nous bien défendus?* CRC n° 115 suppl., March 1977, p. 2)

§ 2. « *Whatever be the facts about this method of deterrence, men should be convinced that the arms race in which an already considerable number of countries are engaged is not a safe way to preserve a steady peace, nor is the so-called balance resulting from this race a sure and authentic peace. Rather than being eliminated thereby, the causes of war are in danger of being gradually aggravated.* »

Let us admit it. But then, what shall we do? Shall we disarm? Yes, but on the condition that everyone does the same! Otherwise? We must arm, arm, arm, as *Action française* used to say in 1938.

The arms race is an inevitable consequence of deterrence. One ought to know what he wants and « *beware of thinking that a state of deterrence has been acquired once and for all: science and technology progress rapidly and a type of submarine or missile that is today invulnerable could one day be supplanted by a new technology, a laser, a killer satellite, or any other invention. An antimissile weapon will trigger counter-measures, which will themselves be neutralised, and so on. Throughout the whole history of mankind there has never existed an absolute weapon. Why should the nuclear weapon be an exception to this rule? If it is appropriate to give it the credence that it presently deserves, it would be absurd and criminal to rely only on it and to abandon having standard armed forces.* »

Now, « *armies cannot be improvised, they are a continuous creation as regards the soldier and his weapons; any abandonment of training men and of the study of material risks being irremediable.* » (*ibid.*)

The Council, however, could not care less and only thinks of disarming us under the pretext of charity:

« *While extravagant sums are being spent for the furnishing of ever new weapons, an adequate remedy cannot be provided for the multiple miseries afflicting the whole modern world (go and say it in Beijing, Tripoli, Cuba, Pyongyang, Tel-Aviv, and Teheran!). Disagreements between nations are not really and radically healed; on the contrary, they spread the infection to other parts of the earth. New approaches based on reformed attitudes must be taken to remove this trap and to emancipate the world from its crushing anxiety through the restoration of genuine peace.* »

This Council, which has *reformed* Jesus Christ's Church contrary to the *spirit* of Her divine Founder, now wants to « *reform attitudes* » in order to achieve universal peace... in the name of whom? Of what? Of what authority?

§ 3. « *Therefore, we say it again: the arms race is an utterly treacherous trap for humanity, and one which ensnares the poor to an intolerable degree. It is much to be feared that if this race persists, it will eventually spawn all the lethal ruin whose path it is now making ready.* »

It is not the « *arms race* » that is « *an utterly treacherous trap for humanity* » and the cause of so many hardships, but the stubborn refusal of Popes to obey Our Lady of Fatima's requests. She and She alone has a "global", "worldwide" project to bring about peace. Thus, it is the Popes' obstinate disobedience that prepares « *lethal ruin* », ruin that is already present in so many parts of the world.

§ 4. « *Warned by the calamities which the human race has made possible* (for reasons that are apparently unknown to the Council, although Heaven has explicitly revealed them to the aforesaid human race through the agency of three little children from Portugal), *let us make use of the interlude granted us from above* (where is « above »?) *and for which we* (who is « we »?) *are thankful to become more conscious of our own responsibility and to find means for resolving our disputes in a manner more worthy* (of whom? Of God, our Creator and Father? Not at all; rather, worthy) *of man.* »

Notice that the will of God is not taken into consideration. Is the Council aware of the existence of God? From the first to the last page of this "pastoral Constitution", its authors display a practical atheism that is insulting to God, to the Angels and Saints. Nevertheless, the latter do exist, fortunately for us...

« *Divine Providence* (this invalidates what I have just written, unless...) *urgently demands of us* (by what new manifestation of His will?) *that we free ourselves from the age-old slavery of war* (so, it cannot be « *Divine Providence* », because « war is the natural state of peoples », and Divine Providence does not contradict this). *If we refuse to make this effort, we do not know where we will be led by the evil road we have set upon.* »

The visions of Our Lady of Fatima's "Secret" show us clearly « *the evil road we have set upon* ». It is the road to Hell in this world and in the next, if we refuse to wage war on the demonic powers that are leading the world down the road to ruin. These visions impose an opposite « *effort* » on us, that of waging war: « Cold war is pursued in the shadows of espionage, in economic competition and in the extension of zones of influence. As for open war, it is necessary to prepare long for it, to unleash it suddenly, to conduct it with strength and heroism, and also to know how to bring it to a happy end through wise and difficult treaties, or else to suspend it at the least cost. It is a sovereign art to be practised at all times. » (*Point n° 87*)

Towards the absolute proscription of war. International action in order to avoid war.

War must be waged against war, thus: general subversion.

82. § 1. « *It is our clear duty, therefore, to strain every muscle in working for the time when all war can be completely outlawed by international consent* (against the very Divine will expressed by Our Lord in the Gospel: « I have come to bring not peace but the sword » Mt 10:34, for the good reason that He has come to combat the Prince of this evil world).

« *This goal undoubtedly requires the establishment of some universal public authority* (at Satan's disposal and more universal than the Catholic Church, who is, for her part, at Jesus Christ's disposal) *acknowledged as such by all* (Communists and Freemasons included, who are, for their part, in league against the Church) *and endowed with the power to safeguard on the behalf of all, security, regard for justice, and respect for rights* (always in the absolute sense of the word: « *the rights* »... of "man"). *But before this hoped for authority can be set up, the highest existing international centres must devote themselves vigorously to the pursuit of better means for obtaining common security* (against whom, since there is no longer any enemy? Oh come on, against the Church, against Christianity... obviously!). »

One might think he were reading the words of the Antichrist in the book that Soloviev attributes to him: "*The public road to the peace and well-being of the world*" (cf. *Il est ressuscité* n° 43, February 2006, p. 36).

In order for such a text to emanate from the "authentic Magisterium", yes, from the Pope and the bishops of the whole world, we must have entered the last times announced by St. Paul to the *Thessalonians*: « *When they shall say, "Peace and Security," even then destruction will come upon them, as birth pangs upon her who is with child and they will not escape* » (1 Th 5:3). So, it is better to have *War and Insecurity* for us to remain vigilant!

The Council appeals to « *the highest existing international centres* ». Yesterday, it was the League of Nations. « *Today* », it is the UN. Now, experience shows that « the worst evil that can befall a people is to see its interests and rights entrusted to the protection of cosmopolitan assemblies. Their teams of functionaries, owing loyalty to no country, have a position to save; they have their interests to serve, which they will not have compromised and the demands of their secret self-interest are for the most part written in their sovereign decrees [...]. God keep us from falling unarmed to the rigours of international courts! » ("*The Pope at UNO*", *Letter to my friends* n° 215, October 1965, published in CCR n° 72 pp. 12-19)

« *Since peace must be born of mutual trust between nations and not be imposed on them through a fear of the available weapons, everyone must labour to put an end at last to the arms race,* »

Someone must have considered that this categorical imperative was really too chimerical; he has added:

« *and to make a true beginning of disarmament, not unilaterally indeed, but proceeding at an equal pace according to agreement, and backed up by true and workable safeguards.* »

At the time, the two intended "blocs", situated on both sides of the Iron Curtain, signed eagerly and with equal dishonesty such a "resolution", each continuing its preparations for battle while spying on the other! But the Council did not care about that and had its head in the clouds:

§ 2. « *In the meantime, efforts which have already been made and are still underway to eliminate the danger of war are not to be underrated* (on 5 November 1964, Cardinal Alfrink declared in the aula: « *Our pastoral solicitude seeks the good seed, even in the Communist world.* ») *On the contrary, support should be given to the good will of the very many leaders who work hard to do away with war, which they abominate. These men, although burdened by the extremely weighty preoccupations of their high office, are nonetheless moved by the very grave peacemaking task to which they are bound, even if they cannot ignore the complexity of matters as they stand.* »

It sounds like General de Gaulle on the eve of the opening of the Council; since « matters were as they stood », he had just abandoned Algeria, with the support of French bishops, who condemned « violence, from wherever it comes »...

« *We should fervently ask God* (which one?) *to give these men the strength to go forward perseveringly and to follow through courageously on this work of building peace with vigour* (whereby there will be total equality, unlimited freedom - though directed

towards the good of all - and thus complete brotherhood among all men without distinction). *It is a work of supreme love for mankind* (whatever is this boundless « *philanthropy* » that is broader than Christian charity?). *Today it certainly demands that they extend their thoughts and their spirit beyond the confines of their own nation, that they put aside national selfishness* (I underscore: up until the Council, it was called the love for one's country and was sacred) *and ambition to dominate other nations* (as though the one would imply the other), *and that they nourish a profound reverence for the whole of humanity, which is already making its way so laboriously toward greater unity.* »

« Before Christ, philosophies - pantheist, it should be noted - had already claimed to regard the world as a whole, to consider mankind as a fraternal and unified body. But lacking even the least beginnings of practical realisation, they simply reinforced the pride of the philosophers and the despotism of princes. During the times of Christendom, visionaries - heretics, it should be noted - announced the imminent advent of a new world order of universal brotherhood to be born of the spiritual and social revolution which they were preaching. In our "postchristian" times, the religion of a unified and fraternal mankind has become one of the dominant ideologies of the modern world. » (*Point n° 55*)

It is MASDU. Anathema sit!

§ 3. « *The problems of peace and of disarmament have already been the subject of extensive, strenuous and constant examination. Together with international meetings dealing with these problems, such studies should be regarded as the first steps toward solving these serious questions, and should be promoted with even greater urgency by way of yielding concrete results in the future* (what an admission that the result to date has been nil!... as was foreseeable). *Nevertheless, men should take heed not to entrust themselves only to the efforts of some, while not caring about their own attitudes* (of whom do you speak? What gibberish!).

« *For government officials who must at one and the same time guarantee the good of their own people and promote the universal good* (here, heads of State are depicted to resemble Vatican II's bishops) *are very greatly dependent on public opinion and feeling. It does them no good to work for peace as long as feelings of hostility, contempt and distrust, as well as racial hatred and unbending ideologies, continue to divide men and place them in opposing camps* (for example in the Middle East).

« *Consequently there is above all a pressing need for a renewed education of attitudes and for new inspiration in public opinion. Those who are dedicated to the work of education, particularly of the young* (in Qur'anic and Rabbinic schools), *or who mould public opinion* (the media), *should consider it their most weighty task to instruct all in fresh sentiments of peace* (go and tell it to the directors of Arte - the Franco-German cultural channel - and of other Canal + stations - French Pay TV. For, if you confine yourself to preaching it to the directors of KTO - the French Catholic Pay TV channel -, the result will be to disarm Catholics alone). *Indeed, we all need a change of heart as we regard the entire world and those tasks which we can perform in unison for the betterment of our race.* »

In fact, international action taken to promote peace is the work of diplomacy, an art fallen into disuse since the creation of the UN and the democratisation of international relations. Diplomacy, « like the military art, is a royal art. Indeed, it is the very foremost art, if wisdom takes precedence over force and the conservation of peace be of a higher value than the conduct of war » (*Point n° 88*). Both are beyond the reach of regimes based on opinion, on parties and on parliaments, regimes that, therefore, are inconsequential, talkative, contentious.

§ 4. « *But we should not let false hope deceive us* (« *Gaudium et Spes* », the first two words of this voluminous "pastoral Constitution" are far off... At last here is the language of wisdom). *For unless enmities and hatred are put away and firm, honest agreements concerning world peace are reached in the future, humanity, which already is in the middle of a grave crisis, even though it is endowed with remarkable knowledge, will perhaps be brought to that dismal hour in which it will experience no peace other than the dreadful peace of death.* »

The most extravagant « *joy and hope* » gives way to the melodramatic tone. But it is talk for the sake of talking. Or rather: it is to talk as though God does not exist, as though « *death* » were not a divine chastisement, as though war, and beyond death, the torture and perpetual confinement in Hell were not the fate of wicked men.

« *But, while we say this, the Church of Christ, present in the midst of the anxiety of this age, does not cease to hope most firmly. She intends to propose to our age over and over again, in season and out of season, this apostolic message: "Behold, now is the acceptable time" for a change of heart; "behold, now is the day of salvation."* »

The quote from St. Paul (2 Co 6:2) brings us suddenly back to reality. Between Christ's advent and His return, an « *acceptable time* » for a change of heart passes by; « *behold, now is the day of salvation* », the delay, which is granted for our conversion, a time of pilgrimage, that is both brief and laden with hardships with a view to the glory to come. The Council assigns to this time of grace a goal totally different from that of salvation which, let us repeat it in season and out of season, consists in leaving the way that leads to Hell in order to take the one that leads to Heaven.

SECTION 2 SETTING UP AN INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

THE CAUSES OF DISORDERS AND THEIR REMEDIES.

83. « *In order to build up peace* (in this world) *above all the causes of discord among men, especially injustice, which foment wars must be rooted out* (a statement of the obvious...). *Not a few of these causes come from excessive economic inequalities and from putting off the steps needed to remedy them.* »

Forty years later, the world-wide crisis caused by "the acts of imprudence" committed by capitalism, brings everyone back to the equality... of poverty, a Gospel beatitude that is completely absent from the Second Vatican Council's thoughts:

« *Thus, to the Sillon*, St. Pius X said, every inequality of condition is an injustice, or at least, a diminution of justice? Here we have a principle that conflicts sharply with the nature of things, a principle conducive to jealousy, injustice, and subversive to any social order. » (*Letter on the Sillon* n° 23)

« *Other causes of discord, however, have their source in the desire to dominate* (against the imperialism of one dominating nation; against the Holy Roman Empire, for example, posing as master of the world, the French Capetian monarchy stood out for a thousand

years and never did the France of the French Kings make such a claim on its own behalf) *and in a contempt for persons. And, if we look for deeper causes, we find them in human envy, distrust (a new capital sin), pride, and other egotistical passions* (distrust is not necessarily an « *egotistical passion* », it is sometimes wisdom). *Man cannot bear so many ruptures in the harmony of things* (the one who gives himself over to them has only himself to blame... don't you think so?). *Consequently, the world is constantly beset by strife and violence between men, even when no war is being waged. Besides, since these same evils are present in the relations between various nations as well, in order to overcome or forestall them and to keep violence once unleashed within limits it is absolutely necessary for countries to cooperate more advantageously and more closely together and to organise together international bodies and to work tirelessly for the creation of organisations which will foster peace.* »

The only « *international institution* » that stands fast is the Catholic Church: « *this is a proven truth, a historical fact* », to speak as St. Pius X did. The only « *organisation which will foster peace* » lies in Rome.

THE COMMUNITY OF NATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

84. § 1. « *In view of the increasingly close ties of mutual dependence today between all the inhabitants and peoples of the earth* (for example between Israelis and Palestinians, who are separated by the nine-metre-tall, concrete "security wall"...), *the apt pursuit and efficacious attainment of the universal common good now require of the community of nations that it organise itself in a manner suited to its present responsibilities, especially toward the many parts of the world which are still suffering from unbearable want* (for example the Gaza Strip...). »

Whatever is a « *universal common good* »? We have already noticed the want, the nullity, the absence of any definition of the *common good* in *Gaudium et spes'* chapter devoted to "the human community". This chapter expressed the same alleged observation - an observation devoid of foundation - of a « *mutual dependence today between all the inhabitants and peoples of the earth* » (26, 1; *supra*).

The present crisis, which specifically affects « *all the peoples of the earth* », makes us weigh up the error, the madness of such globalisation that aims at determining a « *universal common good* ». Forty years after the Second Vatican Council and its recommendations, the « *unbearable want* » reaches the more prosperous areas. What a fine result! But it was not for want of having stated all the categorical imperatives of a super theo-democratic Caesaropapism!

§ 2. « *To reach this goal, organisations of the international community, for their part, must make provision for men's different needs, both in the fields of social life (such as food supplies, health, education, labour) and also in certain special circumstances which can crop up here and there, e.g., the need to promote the general improvement of developing countries, or to alleviate the distressing conditions in which refugees dispersed throughout the world find themselves, or also to assist migrants and their families.* »

The « *international community* » in question here is the totality of the democratic peoples who are ordained to live under the political tutelage of the UN and the cultural tutelage of UNESCO with a view to universal peace. Since Pius XI's condemnation of *Action française*, the error has been to neglect and even to reprove national particularities in defiance of St. Joan of Arc's incomparable lesson that consecrated French nationalism with a divine blessing by submitting it to the universal sovereignty of Christ and of His divine Mother.

In the twentieth century, Our Lady has brilliantly manifested Her power in favour of Portugal and Spain, promising to extend Her benevolent power to the whole world by means of the consecration of Russia to Her Immaculate Heart.

She did not promise to do so by the mediation of international institutions.

§ 3. « *Already existing international and regional organisations are certainly well-deserving of the human race. These are the first efforts at laying the foundations on an international level for a community of all men to work for the solution to the serious problems of our times, to encourage progress everywhere, and to obviate wars of whatever kind. In all of these activities the Church takes joy in the spirit of true brotherhood flourishing between Christians and non-Christians as it strives to make ever more strenuous efforts to relieve abundant misery.* »

For example in Iraq: « *It is still hell in Kirkuk and in Mosul* », Canon Vigneron, who regularly goes to these towns, reports: « *For at least two years terrorists have been seeking out targets; the outcome is that Christians are being hunted down. In October 2008, about fifteen Christians were coldly shot down with a submachine gun.* » (*Dernières nouvelles d'Alsace*, 10 April 2009)

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN THE ECONOMIC FIELD.

85. § 1. « *The present solidarity of mankind also calls for a revival of greater international cooperation in the economic field. Although nearly all peoples have become politically autonomous, they are far from being free of every form of undue dependence, and far from escaping all danger of serious internal difficulties.* »

It does not come to Our Lords Bishops' minds to establish a relationship of cause and effect between « *political autonomy* », which is a euphemism for *decolonisation*, and its ensuing misery: « *This abandonment of the legitimate order - whether authorised by the hierarchy or not and committed solely out of pride - was carried out in favour of the internationalist, pacifist, egalitarian, libertarian utopia. It immediately produced the most flagrant, the most enormous violation of the Decalogue that History has ever recorded.*» (*Letter to my friends* n° 139, April 1963)

§ 2. « *The development of a nation depends on human and financial aids* (another truism, I tell you!). *The citizens of each country must be prepared by education and professional training to discharge the various tasks of economic and social life* (to think that a Council had been convened to state the obvious!). *But this in turn requires the aid of foreign (Chinese) specialists who, when they give aid, will not act as overlords (never!), but as helpers and fellow-workers* (and how! As servants...). *Developing nations will not be able to procure material assistance unless radical changes are made in the established procedures of modern world commerce* (and of finance... the Council did not specify what « *changes* » were desirable, but forty years later the present crisis opens new perspectives). *Other aid should be provided as well by advanced nations in the form of gifts, loans or financial investments. Such help should be accorded with generosity and without greed on the one side, and received with complete honesty on the other side.* »

These recommendations would have had more weight if Vatican finances and financiers had set a good example. But David Yallop's enquiry into Pope John Paul I's mysterious death during the night from 28 to 29 September 1978, has revealed that since the reign of

Pius XI the Vatican had become an element of this “anonymous and vagabond fortune” that knows no other rule than that of making profit and whose god is money (*Murder at the Vatican*, CCR n° 172, October 1984).

Soon after the Council, Paul VI decided to organise an enormous flight of capital in order to avoid paying taxes on the profits made on share portfolios that the Vatican held or managed even though the Pope had stigmatised this practice in his encyclical *Populorum progressio* (1967). This transaction carried out under the nose of the Italian State resulted in a grave economic crisis for the country with very harsh repercussions on the poor in the year 1970. Consequently, « the cancer of the Vatican’s criminality » spread throughout the world.

When he became Pope on 26 August 1978, Albino Luciani « remembered how the priests and the poor had been robbed by the Milanese and Vatican mafia when the *Banca Cattolica del Veneto* had been sold. He remembered many other things that his friend Cardinal Benelli had told him with bitter irony, and he vowed himself to the task of cleaning out these Augean stables, by which I mean the Administration of the Patrimony of the Apostolic See, Pope Paul’s financial centre. » (*ibid.*).

He died of it as a victim of a Masonic crime in the night from 28 to 29 September. It is so clear that the Abbé de Nantes felt it to be so on the same day and immediately wrote: « It was opening the secret dossiers of Paul VI that killed him. » (CCR n° 172, Oct. 1984).

Let us continue to read in the light of these tragic events, which enlighten us greatly and lead us to “disqualify” for good this Council that has turned God’s Holy Church into a den of thieves.

§ 3. « *If an authentic economic order is to be established on a world-wide basis, an end will have to be put to profiteering (at what rate of return does profit become « profiteering »?), to national ambitions, to the appetite for political supremacy, to militaristic calculations, and to machinations for the sake of spreading and imposing ideologies. Proposals are made in favour of numerous economic and social systems. It is to be hoped that experts in such affairs will find common bases for a healthy world trade. This hope will be more readily realised if individuals put aside their personal prejudices and show that they are prepared to undertake sincere discussions.* »

The present crisis tolls the knell for the « *authentic economic order* » that the Second Vatican Council advocated. It is true that this was due to the fact that no one had consented to put « *an end to profiteering* », but the least one can say is that the Vatican financiers did not set an example!

As for the « *appetite for political supremacy* », « *militaristic calculations* » as well as « *machinations for the sake of spreading and imposing ideologies* », it was in Moscow that an end should have been put to them, since the Fathers were on such good terms with the Communist authorities! But it was Spain and Portugal that were in their sights, these the last survivors of Christendom, which the greatest Council of all time renounced.

Let us see what « *economic and social systems* » the Council discerns in order to put them on the way to « *healthy world trade* » by means of « *sincere discussions* ».

SOME USEFUL NORMS.

86. § 1. « *The following norms seem useful for such cooperation* (none of this is “normative”; it lacks the force of obligation or sanction; it is just a piece of expert advice):

§ 2. a) « *Developing nations should take great pains* (who are, what are the pains of nations? At whom is this recommendation aimed?) *to seek as the object for progress* (what? The eternal salvation of souls? No; rather) *to express and secure the total human fulfillment of their citizens* (election campaigns led by all the parties, whether on the right or the left, promise « *total human fulfillment of their citizens* » ; but the way politicians act is not always devoid of equivocation, I would even go so far as to say: of lies). *They should bear in mind that progress arises and grows above all out of the labour and genius of the nations themselves because it has to be based, not only on foreign aid, but especially on the full utilisation of their own resources, and on the development of their own culture* (of poppies in Afghanistan...) *and traditions* (even in religious matters; which is not without repercussions on cattle breeding in India and pig breeding in Moslem countries). *Those who exert the greatest influence on others* (China) *should be outstanding in this respect* (and set a good example for the Koreans).

§ 3. b) *On the other hand, it is a very important duty of the advanced nations to help the developing nations in discharging their above-mentioned responsibilities. They should therefore gladly carry out on their own home front those spiritual (?) and material readjustments that are required for the realisation of this universal cooperation.* »

These readjustments are harrowing for France and its African expansion, if it is a question of France and Africa returning to the Gospel and to the civilisation that is its fruit. Let us see:

§ 4. « *Consequently, in business dealings with weaker and poorer nations, they should be careful to respect their profit, for these countries need the income they receive on the sale of their homemade products to support themselves.* »

Therefore, it is impermissible to plunder raw materials provided by their soil and substrata. The Council, however, does not challenge, for all that, the system that dooms « *weaker and poorer nations* » to this pillage.

§ 5. c) « *It is the role of the international community to coordinate and promote development, but in such a way that the resources earmarked for this purpose will be allocated as effectively as possible, and with complete equity. It is likewise this community’s duty, with due regard for the principle of subsidiarity, so to regulate economic relations throughout the world that these will be carried out in accordance with the norms of justice.* »

Thus, the Second Vatican Council supports the capitalo-socialist system, even in its globalisation. At the same time it casts itself in the role of its moral guardian; it is a lost cause. For business to be booming, one must be free from any moral law. This explains why there is currently great impatience in the financial world over returning to “*business as usual*”, heedless of the economic and social consequences of the “crisis”. This foolhardiness risks plunging us back into an even deeper crisis... to the point of causing the collapse of the system.

§ 6. « *Suitable organisations should be set up to foster and regulate international business affairs, particularly with the underdeveloped countries, and to compensate for losses resulting from an excessive inequality of power among the various*

nations. This type of organisation, in unison with technical cultural and financial aid, should provide the help which developing nations need so that they can advantageously pursue their own economic advancement. »

This recommendation is powerless against American imperialism and its commercial strategy, which tends to enslave everything to American interests: steel industry, aeronautics, agriculture.

§ 7. d) « *In many cases there is an urgent need to revamp economic and social structures. But one must guard against proposals of technical solutions that are untimely. This is particularly true of those solutions providing man with material conveniences, but nevertheless contrary to man's spiritual nature and advancement. For "not by bread alone does man live, but by every word which proceeds from the mouth of God" (Mt 4:4). Every sector of the family of man carries within itself and in its best traditions some portion of the spiritual treasure entrusted by God to humanity, even though many may not be aware of the source from which it comes. »*

We, too, ardently appeal - and more than ever in our present-day world - for a « *revamping of economic and social structures* » and we call this "ecology". Founded on belief and trust in God, Creator and Providence, benevolent and beneficent, and strengthened by the lessons of the past which show what the French people, once liberated and made fraternal, are capable of, our national restoration will have as its sovereign rule the fundamental principle of ecological science and art: the science of the ideal conditions and of the possible realisations of family prosperity, through the virtue of prudence and for the purpose of a happy life involving fraternal human communities.

The principle and foundation of it is the harmony of the land, the village and work. It is the most precious heritage of our thousand-year-old civilisation. We must save what remains of it. We must try to rebuild what has disappeared and continue to construct human civilisation in accordance with this Wisdom, which is more divine and Christian than human.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND DEMOGRAPHIC INCREASE.

87. § 1. « *International cooperation is needed today especially for those peoples who, besides facing so many other difficulties, likewise undergo pressures due to a rapid increase in population. There is an urgent need to explore, with the full and intense cooperation of all, and especially of the wealthier nations, ways whereby the human necessities of food and a suitable education can be furnished and shared with the entire human community. But some peoples could greatly improve upon the conditions of their life if they would change over from antiquated methods of farming to the new technical methods, applying them with needed prudence according to their own circumstances. Their life would likewise be improved by the establishment of a better social order and by a fairer system for the distribution of land ownership. »*

It is a rehash of 66,1 in order to hammer the socialist chimera home (71, 6). Certain countries that revolutionary egalitarianism has emancipated from their colonial frameworks in order to satisfy better the capitalist countries, are nations in name only. Our powerful Catholic country cannot remain impervious to this endemic misery. It will thus be necessary to recreate a framework of relationships that will not be a simple return to the colonisation of the past, which, moreover, Masonic powers too often perverted.

Today generalised corruption pervades Africa where the quasi-totality of the international aid received is misappropriated. It will thus be necessary to imagine relationships based on protective inequality, the aim of which will be to impose order and increase the prosperity of families in these presently poverty-stricken countries.

« In the past, Africans who came to Europe to visit agricultural shows stood speechless when they were presented huge vehicles with twelve ploughshares or ultramodern combine harvesters that foreign aid would have enabled them to procure. Suddenly, during a detour through a museum of old ploughs, they exclaimed: "That's what we need!" These men were not acting under the influence of any complex; they were simply wise. They realised what dependence, proletarianisation and, let us be frank, colonialism in the worst sense of the word could be triggered by too sudden a modernisation, without requisite training. We remember, moreover, that one day Edgar Pisani himself invoked the right to err because he had too hastily advocated the ultra-modernisation of African land devoted to agriculture.

« Now, we learn that millions of hectares of land in Malagasy, Sudan, and Ethiopia... are reported to be coveted by Eastern nations, Saudi Arabia, South Korea, and perhaps China. Faced with an expected shortage of land to feed their population whose numbers and need only grow, they are said to be seeking their food and even their energy security not through an exchange of goods but rather in the appropriation of the lands of these countries. In exchange, they could undoubtedly finance infrastructures and offer guarantees to safeguard the environment. On the other hand, the worst can be feared for the local farmers, who are likely to be driven out or proletarianised. At the same time, however, an effort has been undertaken in favour of these farmers thanks to well-targeted investments that are intended to enable them to develop the land of which they ought to remain the owners. A new colonialism is in view, and its not originating in Europe will not make it any more scrupulous. In particular there is the possibility that this development will be accompanied by new hunger revolts. » (*La France agricole*, 16 January 2009)

§ 2. « *Governments undoubtedly have rights and duties, within the limits of their proper competency, regarding the population problem in their respective countries, for instance, in the line of social and family life legislation, or regarding the migration of country-dwellers to the cities, or with respect to information concerning the condition and needs of the country. Since men today are giving thought to this problem and are so greatly disturbed over it, it is desirable in addition that Catholic specialists, especially in the universities, skilfully pursue and develop studies and projects on all these matters. »*

Since the Council does not give any concrete directive, here is what we can already lay down as a principle: if we want to surmount the present crisis, we need to restore to the family its place as prime agent in society. In our current system based on the contrary principle according to which « *man must be considered as the centre and crown of the world* » (12, 1), the family only comes at the end of all else.

To this end, « *Catholic specialists* » have the duty to remind « *governments* » that their first « *rights and duties* » are to restore indissoluble monogamistic marriage as well as paternal and parental power in the legitimate family community, and to proscribe abortion absolutely. At least in the natural and Christian French Law.

Given our "pluralist" society, and taking into account the decadence of morals, other kinds of family law will be recognised, Orthodox, Muslim, Jewish, etc., with the exception of individualist anarchy, it is « *undoubtedly* » of the State's « *proper competency* » to

oblige everyone to be loyal to his commitments in accordance with his particular law, while encouraging and protecting conversions to Catholicism.

On the other hand, the State will have to relinquish its usurped tentacular role and to restore to families the freedom to choose concerning the education of their children, health, forms of insurance, savings, inheritances, etc.

As for « *the migration of country-dwellers to the cities* », it is « the consequence of a liberal profit economy and of an egalitarian socialist ideology. The profit of industrial capitalism that demanded the rural exodus, urban concentration, intensified transport networks and the transfer of entire populations. Socialist claims merely accelerated the progress of this system by reducing the individual costs of collective life; allowances were granted to salaried workers, subsidies were given to industry, and the State underwrote the senseless increase in “collective costs”. »

In the end « it is the province that pays for the capital, those who do not count in modern life who pay for its happy beneficiaries. Both morality and economics agree on condemning this system. » (*Point n° 138*) The recourse to the principles of family ecology, when extended to the enterprise and then to the corporation, will in turn bring about the return to a more natural balance. But national authorities alone are able to carry out a reversal of tendencies, in particular by means of a long-term fiscal policy, and to bring about the repopulation of currently deserted areas.

§ 3. « *But there are many today who maintain that the increase in world population, or at least the population increase in some countries, must be radically curbed by every means possible and by any kind of intervention on the part of public authority* (there is no point in gathering a Council only to comply with what « *many maintain* », to the point of becoming accomplices to the termination of pregnancies, in France, less than ten years later!). *In view of this contention, the Council urges everyone* (in the name of what authority?) *to guard against solutions, whether publicly or privately supported, or at times even imposed* (when? Soon! In 1973 ; where? In France! By whom? By the Minister Simone Veil, and the President of the French Republic, Valéry Giscard d'Estaing), *which are contrary to the moral law* (which one? When the Council proclaimed religious freedom, it forbade itself from specifying what « *moral law* » it « *urges everyone* » to respect).

« *For in keeping with man's inalienable right to marry and generate children* (the « *right* » of God, who is *Creator* does not count for anything in the eyes of the Council; only the right of the man who *generates children* counts), *a decision concerning the number of children they will have depends on the right judgement of the parents and it cannot in any way be left to the judgement of public authority* (for those who are aware, it is an allusion to China). *But since the judgement of the parents presupposes a rightly formed conscience, it is of the utmost importance that the way be open for everyone to develop a correct and genuinely human responsibility which respects the divine law* (ah! And which one? It is simple, clear and convincing for the maternal heart as much as for the paternal reason of mankind: God is the Master of life; the lives of the innocent belong to Him especially. Every violent man who makes an attempt on this innocent life commits the crime of homicide) *and takes into consideration the circumstances of the situation and the time.*

« *But sometimes this requires an improvement in educational and social conditions, and, above all, formation in religion or at least a complete moral training* (both are inseparable), « for there is no true civilisation without a moral civilisation, and no true moral civilisation without the true religion: this is a proven truth, a historical fact », St. Pius X wrote in the *Letter on the Sillon*, n° 36). *Men should discreetly* (insidiously, maliciously...) *be informed, furthermore, of scientific advances in exploring methods whereby spouses can be helped in regulating the number of their children and whose safeness has been well proven and whose harmony with the moral order has been ascertained.* »

The enemy of any Malthusianism, a good Christian puts his trust in God, and is sure that He will provide for his needs. But since the Council addresses « *all men* », the restriction of propaganda and of contraceptive prophylaxis to the narrow limits of Catholic morality remains entirely theoretical. Finally, two years after the Council, in his encyclical *Populorum progressio* (1967), Pope Paul VI would call on the all-providing State to control and regulate population increase.

Here is the result: « The fact is that the State is accorded the right in practice to organise sex education, birth control propaganda and the distribution of sterilising agents. Contraceptive and Abortion clinics will become part of the state apparatus, by virtue of the need for demographic control and all this will become an important element in the plan for “*the complete development of man*”! » (*Letter to my friends* n° 245, April 1967, p. 12, published in CCR n° 81, December 1976)

The role of Christians in international cooperation.

88. § 1. « *Christians should cooperate willingly and wholeheartedly in establishing an international order that includes a genuine respect for all freedoms and amicable brotherhood between all* (an unconceivable “sheepfold” at the height of Communist persecution in Russia, in China, in Vietnam!). *This is all the more pressing since the greater part of the world is still suffering from so much poverty that it is as if Christ Himself were crying out in these poor to beg the charity of the disciples* (and their obedience to the requests of His divine Mother?). *Do not let men, then, be scandalised because some countries with a majority of citizens who are counted as Christians have an abundance of wealth* (this wealth is the “rest” promised to those who seek the Kingdom of God and its justice), *whereas others are deprived of the necessities of life and are tormented with hunger, disease, and every kind of misery* (and of vices from which missionaries delivered them by preaching them the Gospel. It was before the Second Vatican Council's proclamation of religious freedom, which put an end to this natural and supernatural benevolence). *The spirit of poverty and charity are the glory and witness of the Church of Christ* (and it has been extinguished by the Second Vatican Council. But we saw it shine for a moment in the person of the holy Pope John Paul I, who stood up against Mammon). »

§ 2. « *Those Christians are to be praised and supported, therefore, who volunteer their services to help other men and nations* (by entering the Foreign Missions Seminary in Paris or the Oblates of Mary Immaculate? No! By going on holiday to Vietnam or to Burkina-Faso, in the service of ngos...). *Indeed, it is the duty of the whole People of God, following the word and example of the bishops, to alleviate as far as they are able the sufferings of the modern age. They should do this too, as was the ancient custom in the Church, out of the substance of their goods, and not only out of what is superfluous.* »

By giving for the collection... « *following the example of the bishops* »? Yes, because they are the ones who take it.

Just read on:

§ 3. « *The procedure of collecting and distributing aids, without being inflexible and completely uniform, should nevertheless be carried on in an orderly fashion in dioceses, nations, and throughout the entire world. Wherever it seems convenient, this activity of Catholics should be carried on in unison with other Christian brothers. For the spirit of charity does not forbid, but on the contrary commands that charitable activity be carried out in a careful and orderly manner. Therefore, it is essential for those who intend to dedicate themselves to the services of the developing nations to be properly trained in appropriate institutes.* »

The « *appropriate institutes* », which *Gaudium et spes* ardently wished for, have come into vogue today under the name of ngos, “non-governmental organisations”. They are not more Catholic for all that... The Church, who is, for her part, called by the Second Vatican Council to become the servant of Masdu, after forty years of good, loyal service and generous collections, is exhausting herself and disappearing as they die, « *one after another, the Bishops, Priests, men and women Religious, and various lay people, men and women of different ranks and positions* », as Our Lady of Fatima announced they would on 13 July 1917, if Her requests were not heeded.

The active presence of the Church in the midst of the international community.

89. § 1. « *Since, in virtue of her mission received from God, the Church preaches the Gospel to all men and dispenses the treasures of grace, she contributes to the ensuring of peace everywhere on earth (except in China or Saudi Arabia...) and to the placing of the fraternal exchange between men on solid ground by imparting knowledge of the divine and natural law (see how the Council empties the Cross of Christ of all its meaning). Therefore, to encourage and stimulate cooperation among men, the Church must be clearly present in the midst of the community of nations (even if it required her to deny Jesus Christ and Jesus Christ crucified) both through her official channels and through the full and sincere collaboration of all Christians - a collaboration motivated solely by the desire to be of service to all (and not to the Catholic Church alone).* »

« *To be of service* » to what? « *What is to come of this collaboration?* St. Pius X already asked? A mere verbal and chimerical construction in which we shall see, glowing in a jumble, and in seductive confusion, the words Liberty, Justice, Fraternity, Love, Equality, and human exultation, all resting upon an ill-understood human dignity. It will be a tumultuous agitation, sterile for the end proposed, but which will benefit the less utopian exploiters of the people. Yes, we can truly say that the *Sillon*, its eyes fixed on a chimera, brings Socialism in its train. » (*Letter on the Sillon*, n° 38)

St. Pius X was a prophet. He forewarned us « that it is crazy to set mankind the goal of constructing a universal democracy, a socialist paradise and that it is blasphemy to make Christ and the Church the builders of this city of Satan. » (*L'humanisme chrétien*, CRC n° 60, September 1972, p. 6)

§ 2. « *This will come about more effectively if the faithful themselves, conscious of their responsibility as men and as Christians will exert their influence in their own milieu to arouse a ready willingness to cooperate with the international community. Special care must be given, in both religious (according to what religion?) and civil (secular and republican?) education, to the formation of youth in this regard.* »

In fact, after the Council, the “new catechisms” conformed with State education. Together they led to the « *result* » that St. Pius X had foreseen: « *We fear that worse is to come: the end result of this developing promiscuousness, the beneficiary of this cosmopolitan social action, can only be a Democracy which will be neither Catholic, nor Protestant, nor Jewish. It will be a religion (for Sillonism, so the leaders have said, is a religion) more universal than the Catholic Church, uniting all men become brothers and comrades at last in the “Kingdom of God” - “We do not work for the Church, we work for mankind.”* » (*Letter on the Sillon*, n° 39)

St. Pius X, however, could not have imagined that such would one day be the goal of all the works of the bishops of the entire world gathered together in a Council!

The role of Christians in international institutions.

90. § 1. « *An outstanding form of international activity on the part of Christians is found in the joint efforts which, both as individuals and in groups, they contribute to institutes already established or to be established for the encouragement of cooperation among nations. There are also various Catholic associations on an international level which can contribute in many ways to the building up of a peaceful and fraternal community of nations. These should be strengthened by augmenting in them the number of well-qualified collaborators, by increasing needed resources (that the aforesaid Milanese and Vatican mafia will generously provide...), and by advantageously fortifying the coordination of their energies. For today both effective action and the need for dialogue demand joint (thus anonymous) projects. Moreover, such associations contribute much to the development of a universal outlook - something certainly appropriate for Catholics. They also help to form an awareness of genuine universal (and not only Catholic) solidarity and responsibility.* »

Let us repeat it: « *Two loves have built two Cities: love of self to the contempt of God, and love of God, to the contempt of self* », St. Augustine wrote. The whole question is to know to which of these two “Cities” the « *institutes for the encouragement of cooperation among nations* » belong.

The following paragraph is going to tell us:

§ 2. « *Finally, it is very much to be desired that Catholics, in order to fulfil their role properly in the international community, will seek to cooperate actively and in a positive manner both with their separated brothers who together with them profess the Gospel of charity and with all men thirsting for true peace.* »

Thus, according to the Second Vatican Council, the “salvation” of mankind finally comes about in our time by means of the « *active and positive cooperation* » of everyone in forming an « *international community* », the cement of which is the Gospel in its modern form of the cult of man, his dignity, and his rights. The Church provides both this Gospel service and the disinterested animation of this unprecedented human effort that accomplishes the design of God on the world. To this end, she collaborates with all religions and human ideologies. This is the first error.

Here is the second error, its corollary. It consists in seeking « *social justice* », not from man himself or from his moral effort but from the things and structures of society:

§ 3. « *The Council, considering the immensity of the hardships which still afflict the greater part of mankind today (after twenty centuries of pre-conciliar Christianity), regards it as most opportune that an organism of the universal Church be set up (in Manhattan or Geneva) in order that both the justice and love of Christ toward the poor might be developed everywhere. The role of such an organism would be to stimulate the (Roman) Catholic community to promote progress in needy regions and international social justice.* »

Injustice is considered as an objective disorder that confronts the technocrat with a political problem. The solution he proposes provides a plan that a collective effort must impose on things and structures. This is tantamount to overlooking vices and virtues, and personal moral conversion. A new world will be built, a world that will be so well-managed that everyone will find himself provided with material, cultural, spiritual goods, distributed from above.

Conclusion **The role of each of the faithful and of individual Churches**

91. § 1. « *Drawn from the treasures of Church teaching (to the exclusion of her purest gem: Pope St. Pius X's Letter on the Sillon), the proposals of this sacred (as it refers to itself) Synod (the Abbé de Nantes more appropriately called it a "baneful Council" as early as 1965, a month before the opening of its fourth session) are intended to assist every man of our time, whether he believes in God or does not explicitly recognise Him (not for going to Heaven, rather), in gaining a sharper insight into their full destiny, and thereby lead them to fashion the world (here below) more to man's surpassing dignity, in searching for a brotherhood which is universal and more deeply rooted (as deep as Hell), and in meeting the urgencies of our ages with a gallant and unified effort born of (under the guise of) love.* »

Vatican III will draw « proposals » totally contrary to those of Vatican II, « from the treasures of Church teaching », which are contained in the Gospel of Jesus Christ and the Tradition of the Church:

1. The Kingdom of God, the Kingdom of Heaven, is not of this world, but in the beyond. It is necessary to die with Christ and lose one's life in order to attain it by rising up with Him to Eternal Life.

2. This conquest receives its force from the faith that baptism gives and continues in the Church through Christian life. We must not worry about the rest because God, our Heavenly Father, has promised it to us « in addition ».

3. No one can serve two masters, and it does not at all profit a man to gain the whole world if he loses his own soul. As for the world, it is under the domination of the Devil who is its Prince, and it constitutes a force opposed to the Reign of Christ, a force that has persecuted Christians throughout the centuries.

§ 2. « *Undeniably this conciliar programme is but a general one in several of its parts; and deliberately so, given the immense variety of situations and forms of human culture in the world.* » This general programme can be summarised in three errors: the naturalism of a "horizontal" religion, the optimism of a confidence in man, in his "good will", in his "natural energies", and a humanism that is falsely presented as evangelical and Christian, and according to which the Catholic religion's providential function is the spiritual animation of universal democracy.

« *Indeed while it presents teaching already accepted in the Church (only since John XXIII), the programme will have to be followed up and amplified (it was, and how greatly by John Paul II!) since it sometimes deals with matters in a constant state of development. Still, we have relied on the word of God (oh really! Give us the references, please!) and the spirit of the Gospel (what « spirit »? In any case, it is not the Holy Spirit, who is not spread indiscriminately in « every man of our time » as an innate energy and nobility). Hence we entertain the hope that many of our proposals will prove to be of substantial benefit to everyone, especially after they have been adapted to individual nations and mentalities by the faithful, under the guidance of their pastors.* »

One hundred years ago, St. Pius X advocated this effort of « adaptation » and showed the ways to achieve it: « The Church, he said, who has never betrayed the happiness of the people by consenting to dubious alliances (until the Second Vatican Council, exclusive), does not have to free herself from the past; that all that is needed is to take up again, with the help of the true workers for a social restoration, the organisms which the Revolution shattered, and to adapt them, in the same Christian spirit that inspired them, to the new environment arising from the material development of today's society. Indeed, the true friends of the people are neither revolutionaries, nor innovators: they are traditionalists. » (n° 44) This was the condemnation in advance of the so-called conciliar "Reform".

Dialogue among all men.

92. § 1. « *By virtue of her mission to shed on the whole world the radiance of the Gospel message, and to unify under one Spirit all men of whatever nation, race or culture (including religion), the Church stands forth as a sign of that brotherhood which allows honest dialogue and gives it vigour.* »

This paragraph summarises the "(anti-) dogmatic Constitution" on the Church, *Lumen gentium*. This contradicts the Catholic dogma formulated at the First Vatican Council according to which the Roman Catholic Church, a visible, historical, hierarchical society, is a sign raised among nations, a permanent « miracle ». Through her four marks or incomparable perfections of Unity, Holiness, Catholicity, and Apostolicity, the Church invites and leads to faith in her supernatural mystery.

The Church is « the created instrument by which God calls all men to salvation and gives them, if they adhere to her through faith, justification, and grace for Eternal Life. The Church is thus the means and the locus of the true religion, of the union of men with their Unique God. The Church is a mother who engenders, through a new birth, the sons of Adam to regained grace. She is a family in which divine life is transmitted from Christ, from generation to generation. » (*The mystery of the Church*, CCR n° 23, January 1972)

Thus, the Church is not only a « sign » of « brotherhood » among « all men », she is its instrument aimed at « unifying » them in one Body, whose Head is Christ and whose soul is the Holy Spirit. She does so not by means of « dialogue » but by the sincere conversion of all to the truth that she preaches.

« Even when He calls all men to the divine Life, it is in subordination to and in view of His one Church. This work of the Holy Spirit is the "formal cause" or the "immanent principle of organisation" of this social Body of which Christ is the Head: His Energy descends and communicates itself hierarchically from the Head to the members according to the degrees of the powers established by Christ. Even

where the Holy Spirit acts in complete liberty by the gift of “charisms”, it is neither in contradiction to nor separate from the hierarchical institution and its apostolic discipline. » (*ibid.*)

It shows clearly enough that “the spirit of the Council” has no affinity with the Holy Spirit. He is even its antithesis, of which the following paragraph provides a new proof:

§ 2. « *Such a mission requires in the first place that we foster within the Church herself mutual esteem, reverence and harmony* (this was standard practice until 1962; the Council abolished them in order to substitute for them a revolutionary despotism that imposes one ideology, one expression, one practise, in the wake of what Fr. Congar called « the October Revolution in the Church »), *through the full recognition of lawful diversity* (what is « *lawful diversity* »? We are going to learn what it is). *Thus all those who compose the one People of God, both (Protestant?) pastors and the general faithful* (but of course! By virtue of a new principle!), *can engage in dialogue with ever abounding fruitfulness. For the bonds which unite the faithful are mightier than anything dividing them. Hence, let there be unity in what is necessary* (the great novelty of the Second Vatican Council: religious freedom!) ; *freedom in what is unsettled* (the Catholic truths challenged by our “separated brethren”!), *and charity in any case* (the “disqualified” Abbé de Nantes and the CCR, who are called a “sect”... in all charity!). »

« The October Revolution in the Church » consisted precisely in replacing the Church, the mystical Body of Christ, the human society whose hierarchy is the efficient cause, with a “People” presented as entirely alive, entirely illuminated, sanctified and gathered together - before the hierarchy remotely intervenes - by the direct, invisible, disinterested, unexpected, and unlimited action of... the Holy Spirit! It is generalised illuminism.

The following paragraph summarises the Decree on Ecumenism, *Unitatis redintegratio*.

§ 3. « *Our hearts embrace also those brothers and communities not yet living with us in full communion; to them we are linked nonetheless by our profession of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and by the bond of charity* (then, whatever do they lack?). *We do not forget that the unity of Christians is today awaited and desired by many, too, who do not believe in Christ; for the farther it advances toward truth* (of freedom) *and love* (for all men except for the members of the Catholic Counter-Reformation) *under the powerful impulse of the Holy Spirit, the more this unity will be a harbinger of unity and peace for the world at large. Therefore, by common effort and in ways which are today increasingly appropriate for seeking this splendid goal effectively, let us take pains to pattern ourselves after the Gospel* (of Lamennais, Sangnier and Maritain) *more exactly every day, and thus work as brothers in rendering service to the human family. For, in Christ Jesus this family is called* (here is a Catholic expression; it contradicts the foregoing material in which the « *human family* » seems an entity already fully constituted) *to the family of the sons of God* (Whose children are they... presently?). »

In the end, « the only visible result (of this ecumenism) has been the detriment suffered by souls: the multitude of Christians outside the Church have been discouraged from converting, and the confidence of the multitude of Catholics who have been invited to get to know, to admire, to aid the schisms and heresies of the past, to the point of shaking their faith. This ecumenism practically results in forming a new universal religion, a vague worldly spiritualism. All will be able to enter it and serve any political utopia in the name of the Gospel of Christ. It is Masdu: the Movement for the Spiritual Animation of Universal Democracy! Ecumenism kills the Church and drives her children to despair. » (*Catholic Ecumenism*, CCR n° 29, July 1972)

We hear in the following the echo of the Declaration *Nostra aetate*, which defines « *the relationships (conduct) of the Church with non-Christian religions* ».

§ 4. « *We think cordially too of all who acknowledge God* (under what denomination?), *and who preserve in their traditions precious* (how much does it cost?) *elements of religion and humanity. We want frank conversation to compel us all to receive the impulses of the Spirit faithfully and to act on them energetically.* »

Among these « *traditions* », Judaism holds the first place as a divine preparation of mankind for the perfect Covenant of God with men in Christ. The religions of ancient paganism have also been considered by certain Fathers as divinely inspired, while other Fathers affirmed that « *the gods of pagans are devils* ». In any case, what would come to them from divine inspiration has been made obsolete since the Church, the sign and sacrament of Salvation, has been raised among nations.

The Council’s great idea, which is summarised in this paragraph, was, according to Paul VI’s will in *Ecclesiam suam*, to preach the brotherhood of all men of all religions, emphasising what is common to them and keeping what separates them hidden. Forty years later, the result is evident: an impressive increase in indifference among Catholics and a sharp fall in missionary zeal.

But there is something even more serious: the Second Vatican Council proclaims a new *Creed*, according to which God is the Father of all men. They are thus brothers, and every form of discrimination, opposition, and persecution must be banished from among them:

§ 5. « *For our part, the desire for such dialogue, which can lead to truth through love alone, excludes no one, though an appropriate measure of prudence must undoubtedly be exercised. We include those who cultivate outstanding qualities of the human spirit, but do not yet acknowledge the Source of these qualities. We include those who oppress the Church and harass her in manifold ways* (here is how the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council have handed over their sheep like so many Little Red Riding Hoods and M. Seguin’s goats (an allusion to a tale of Alphonse Daudet). Do not be surprised at seeing our churches emptied... the wolf has eaten them). *Since God the Father is the origin and purpose of all men, we are all called to be brothers* (the better to eat you, my dear!). *Therefore, if we have been summoned to the same destiny, human and divine, we can and we should work together without violence and deceit* (without any idea of proselytism or wanting to convert Russia) *in order to build up the world in genuine peace.* »

« With such a principle, the Council handed Christ over to the Antichrist with a kiss of death and the Church over to the Counter-Church, acting as though she were allied to her. » (*L’unique salut*, CRC n° 58, July 1972, p. 11) It is what Pope Paul VI did to the letter, in his Closing Address, on 7 December 1965:

« *The Conciliar Church has also, it is true, been much concerned with man, with man as he really is today, living man, man totally taken up with himself, man who not only makes himself the centre of his own interests, but who dares to claim that he is the end and aim of all existence...*

« *Secular, profane humanism has finally revealed itself in its terrible shape and has, in a certain sense, challenged the Council. The religion of God made man has come up against a religion - for there is such a one - of man who makes himself God.*

« *And what happened? An impact, a battle, an anathema? That might have taken place, but it did not. It was the old story of the Samaritan that formed the model for the Council's spirituality. It was filled only with an endless sympathy. Its attention was taken up with the discovery of human needs - which become greater as the son of the earth (sic) makes himself greater.*

« *Do you at least recognise this its merit, you modern humanists who have no place for the transcendence of the things supreme, and come to know our new humanism : we also, we more than anyone else, have the cult of man.* »

« This shows, the Abbé de Nantes wrote to Pope Paul VI in his *Book of accusation*, how your heteropraxy is slipping into a heterodoxy which I must refer to not so much as heresy as apostasy. And all through your apostolic generosity! Against all the wise counsels and infallible teaching of your Predecessors, you play the Good Samaritan, nodding good-naturedly to every man his brother... And in your unfettered love you make friends with the Goliath of the Modern World, kneeling before the Enemy of God who only feels hatred and defiance for you. Instead of fighting, like David, against the Adversary, you express yourself full of love for him, you flatter him, and end up in his exclusive service! Your charity towards the Enemy of God turns into adoration and service, to the extent even of rivalling him in his error and blasphemy. » (p. 11)

A WORLD THAT MUST BE BUILT AND LED TO ITS END.

93. § 1. « *Mindful of the Lord's saying: "By this will all men know that you are My disciples, if you have love for one another" (Jn 13:35), Christians cannot yearn for anything more ardently than to serve the men of the modern world with mounting generosity and success (not in order to divert them from Hell and to lead them to Heaven but in order that man may at last find his full stature, that mankind may become prosperous and fraternal, that the earth may abound in material and spiritual goods, as a first realisation and a foretaste of the Kingdom of God). Therefore, by holding faithfully to the Gospel and benefiting from its resources, by joining with every man who loves and practices justice, Christians have shouldered a gigantic task for fulfillment in this world, a task concerning which they must give a reckoning to Him who will judge every man on the last of days.* »

« The Second Vatican Council was haunted by the just preoccupation of laying out well, end to end, in an extension of one to the other, this side of death to the other, the life of the human, earthly world to the life of the heavenly, divine world. But its error was, in doing so, to bring Heaven in line with the earth, what is divine with what is human, what is spiritual with what is carnal and, all in all, to devalue the supernatural by reducing it to nothing more than a remarkable perfection and the development of human nature. And this is precisely the opposite work, contrary to that of Christ, who during his life on earth, transposed the carnal "*joys and hopes*" of the Jews to the superior level of spiritual realities. » (*L'humanisme chrétien*, CRC n° 60, septembre 1972, p. 12)

« *Not everyone who cries, "Lord, Lord," (cf. Mt 7:21) will enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but those who do the Father's will by taking a strong grip on the work at hand.* »

« The next Council should condemn error but retain this concern and this just ambition of giving to the world a harmonious vision of the two periods of our destiny: the earthly stage and eternal life. How can this be done? By situating the fissure, the great crevasse that all men must cross, the great "Passage", in Hebrew "Pasch", not at bodily death which is nothing but a secondary and expected accident, but at the death and resurrection experienced in Christ who has made the Jew and the pagan into Christians, the sinner into a saint, the man doomed to eternal death into a living being endowed with a perfection which is eternal in itself. » (G. de Nantes, *ibid.*)

« *Now, the Father wills that in all men we recognise Christ our brother and love Him effectively, in word and in deed. By thus giving witness to the truth, we will share with others the mystery of the heavenly Father's love (the nature of which we are still unaware!). As a consequence, men throughout the world will be aroused to a lively hope - the gift of the Holy Spirit - that some day at last they will be caught up in peace and utter happiness in that fatherland radiant with the glory of the Lord.* »

« The Church preaches the Kingdom of God by means of her dogma and turns Christians away from expecting anything from the world here below. By virtue of this supernatural vocation that she makes known to them, she claims and obtains generously an effort of conversion and moral virtues that make of each servant of God an enthusiastic servant of his brothers, a useful element for society! » (*ibid.*, p. 13)

§ 2. « *"Now to Him who is able to accomplish all things in a measure far beyond what we ask or conceive, in keeping with the power that is at work in us - to Him be glory in the Church and in Christ Jesus, down through all the ages of time without end. Amen" (Ep 3:20-21).* »

« *The whole and each one of the points decreed in this Pastoral Constitution have pleased the Council Fathers.* »

Not all of them! There remained 75 opponents, and the initial Council Regulations would oblige making mention of the fact by adding: « *with the exception of 75 votes* ». In order to endow the Acts of the Council with an apparent, although illegal, authority, Pope Paul VI imposed the following formula:

« *And we, by virtue of the apostolic power we hold from Christ, in union with the venerable Fathers, we approve, fix and decree in the Holy Spirit, and we order that what has thus been established in Council be promulgated for the glory of God.* »

« *Given in Rome, at Saint Peter's, on 7 December 1965.*

« *I, Paul, bishop of the Catholic Church.* »

« In none of the promulgations of the sixteen Acts of Vatican II, did Paul VI deign to follow the Council Regulations which had imposed *ne varietur* the formula to be used by the Sovereign Pontiff in person to announce the results of the votes and, in view of these results - here is true collegiality! - proclaim his sovereign decision. »

The initial formula of the Regulations was the following:

« *The decrees and canons that have just been read have received the Fathers' assent (without exception, or with the exception of so many votes). And We too, with the approval of the Council, We will them, establish them and promulgate them as they have been read.* » (Article 49, § 1)

« This formula necessitated drawing attention to the unanimity of the votes or else mentioning the existence of opponents and their number. Previous councils had all been scrupulously faithful to this rule, which distinguishes a sacred Council from a vulgar "robber" Council. It was done at the First Vatican Council, magnificently! When the dogma of Papal Infallibility was proclaimed, Pius IX declared

that "the decrees and canons are pleasing to all the Fathers, except for two of them." In fact, at the final scrutiny of this last public session two opponents did show up. And they moreover, moved as one can imagine, but honored in their authority as Council judges, legislators and definers, immediately wanted to assure the Pope and the Council Fathers of their submission to and acceptance of the new dogma. That kind of honesty, which prevailed among the old Fathers and Doctors of the Church..., was missing at Vatican II!

« Furthermore, in the invention of this novel formula, Paul VI took it upon himself to work a further abuse: he amplified the strictly sober formula laid down by the regulations, to give it an excessive and theologically unacceptable tenor. The superfluous period created by Paul VI falsely gives the sixteen Acts of Vatican II the character of an extraordinary and solemn teaching, therefore infallible and irreformable, when canonically and dogmatically they are not worthy of it. And carrying presumption and impertinence to the extreme, he abusively guarantees them as being of the "Holy Spirit" in an absolutely contestable illuminism. »

« For a quarter of a century I have read that formula at the foot of the Acts of Vatican II and always with dread, so much does it affirm what I cannot believe and what I refuse to accept, even on pain of persecution, excommunication and death: that these Acts are inspired by the Holy Spirit and guaranteed by the infallible Magisterium of the Church. Now, however, the entire deception has burst before my eyes, and the abuse of authority that is so plain has delivered me from a long and heavy anguish. Paul VI was making fools of us! » (CCR n° 247, April 1992, pp. 4-5)

Brother Bruno of Jesus.