



HE IS RISEN!

Editor : Abbé Georges de Nantes

N° 88 – January 2010

He will return with his immense heart, with his heart of fire, his poor man's soul and his smile. He will return ! And the Immaculate Heart of Mary will triumph !

THE HEROIC VIRTUES OF JOHN PAUL II? THEY ARE MOCKING US!

IN 1983, when the Abbé de Nantes took to Rome his *BOOK OF ACCUSATION* against John Paul II, Cardinal Ratzinger was in charge of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. Not only did he not deny the allegations of the Abbé de Nantes, but he did not deign to appear, leaving Msgr. Hamer to respond by a lie, pretending that Father had acknowledged his errors in 1968 during the preliminary inquiry into his case at the Holy Office!

Now, however, twenty-seven years later, if he thinks to respond to the accusation of heresy, schism and scandal by the indirect means of beatifying John Paul II, it is he who is the liar this time! He lies by omission because, before proclaiming the heroic character of the faith of John Paul II, it would first of all be necessary to respond to the accusation made by the Abbé de Nantes according to which the so-called "Servant of God" was a "**corruptor of the Faith.**" If the Abbé de Nantes is wrong, let them say it loudly and firmly!

In 2005 we sent a memorandum to the postulator for the

cause of John Paul II, in conformity with the edict of Cardinal Camillo Ruini, Vicar General of Pope Benedict XVI for the Diocese of Rome, inviting all the faithful to communicate with him directly, or to send to the diocesan tribunal of the vicariate of Rome, all the information that could be drawn from facts favourable to *or contrary to the reputation for sanctity of the said Servant of God.*

This memorandum never received the least response from the authorities. Consequently, to proclaim the heroic virtues of John Paul II without knowing the objections brought against his practice of the theological virtues of faith, hope, and charity constitutes a lie by omission.

In fact, we demonstrated that the said Servant of God had strayed from the Catholic Faith (I), that there resulted from this a turning away from Christian hope in favour of the utopia of a new world here below (II), provoking a tragic cooling of the virtue of charity in the Church (III.)

We reproduce this indictment as a final appeal to the Magisterium of the Church for the honour of God.

I. AGAINST THE VIRTUE OF FAITH

ANTHROPOLOGICAL ERROR: THE FAITH IN MAN WHO MAKES HIMSELF GOD

As an introduction to his complaint, the Abbé de Nantes cited a text on which he declared himself prepared to stake his entire Faith, his entire life: « **One on which the whole case could be judged** ». It concerns pages 222 to 227 of the « **Dialogue with André Frossard – from his book *N'ayez pas peur* (Be not afraid), in which the part attributed to you, the Abbé de Nantes wrote, addressing himself to John Paul II, was, in fact, written, revised and carefully amended by you before being published in 1982.** »

In the incriminating pages, the aforesaid Servant of God quoted the reply of Jesus to Pilate: « **Yes, I am a king. For this was I born and for this came I into the world that I should give testimony to the truth. Everyone that is of the truth hears My voice** ». He commented: « *Christ is king in the sense that in Him, in the testimony He rendered to the truth, is made manifest the "kingship" of every human being, the expression of the transcendent character of the person. Such is the proper heritage of the Church.* »

This affirmation categorically contradicts Catholic tradition according to which *the truth* for which Our Lord Jesus Christ died concerns God His Father and Himself, in His unique, sacred, inviolable and inaccessible Holiness, in other words, in His "transcendence" as Son of God, only King of the universe and Saviour of His people. On the other hand, the aforesaid Servant of God makes Christ into a martyr of the dignity, the kingship, and the transcendence of man.

His *error* consists in proclaiming, by means of the Kantian concept of "transcendence", that man, every man, whatever man, is beyond all things and that there is no proportion and thus no relationship between him and the other beings of this world other than one of sovereignty.

This same error could already be found in the retreat preached before Paul VI in 1976 by Cardinal Wojtyla and published in French under the title of "*Sign of Contradiction*". One could read: « *The royal function of Jesus is not first to exercise dominion over others; it is a manifestation of the kingly character of man. This kingly character is embedded within human nature, within the structure of the human personality.* »

The first part of the *Book of Accusation* of the Abbé de Nantes denounced this doctrine of the aforesaid Servant of God as a novelty, without support in the holy Catholic tradition, which counterfeits the teaching of the Christ of the Church. While, according to our Catholic Faith, man is but nothingness before his Creator, and depends on Him through a relationship of love and grace, the aforesaid Servant of God proclaims, in agreement with contemporary atheists, the transcendence of man.

We draw the attention of the tribunal to the irrefutable influence that his master and friend, Mieczyslaw Kotlarczyk, had on the education of the aforesaid Servant of God. The Abbé de Nantes reveals what biographers ordinarily conceal namely that this mentor of the aforesaid Servant of God was a disciple of the theosophist Rudolf Steiner, an adept of a non-dogmatic and evolutionist cosmic Christianity. This cannot be seen as a simple influence on the aforesaid Servant of God in his youth, fascinated by the enthralling magic of the theatrical art, since, when he became the Archbishop of Cracow, he wrote an introduction for Kotlarczyk's book, "The Art of the Living Word". In this introduction he develops a theory according to which « a group of people of one mind subject to the poetic word (*sic*) assumes an ethical significance: the significance of solidarity in the Word (*sic!*), and of loyalty with regard to the Word. »

Oddly enough, this preface of the aforesaid Servant of God does not figure in the inventories of his works...

In order fully to grasp how alien to the Catholic faith is this alleged "transcendence of man", the principle of dialogue with atheists faithfully practiced by the aforesaid Servant of God, one only has to read the transcription of the retreat "*Sign of Contradiction*". In it, he refers to the words of Simeon to the Virgin Mary on the day of the Presentation:

« ***Behold this Child is set for the fall and for the resurrection of many in Israel and for a sign that shall be contradicted.*** » (Lk 2.34).

By applying it to the Hegelian contradiction between the Catholic religion (*thesis*) and modern atheism (*antithesis*), he intends to show that the idea of a God who does not accept the kingship of man is an appalling misunderstanding, which he gives himself the mission of dispelling.

For, instead of condemning the "*speculative deicide*" by which the scientist and the modern philosopher refuses to submit to the authority of God, substituting their own for it, as though they were themselves God, the aforesaid Servant of God justifies this crime of deicide through an entirely new exegesis of the first three chapters of the Book of *Genesis*. His entire reasoning rests on an original interpretation of the Biblical account of original sin, according to which the fault would have consisted not in rising up against God, but in succumbing to the "lie" of Satan, making Adam and Eve believe that God was jealous of their kingship!

The aforesaid Servant of God wrote: « *It all began with an untruth that one might think was merely based on faulty information and showed an innocent intention: "Has God*

told you then not to eat of any of the trees in paradise?" The woman unhesitatingly corrects the faulty information, perhaps without sensing that this is merely an opening gambit, a prelude to what the Father of Lies is about to say to her. Here is what follows. First he calls into question the veracity of God: "You will not die!" Thus he attacks the very existence of the Covenant between God and man. » (p. 48)

The Abbé de Nantes points out that Cardinal Wojtyla has, in his account, « **skirted around the existence of a God-given precept to our first parents** »: « ***You may freely eat of every tree of the garden; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall die.*** » (2.16-17) The result of this clever « **omission** » is the effacing of this first truth « **that God has the right to command, that He has in fact commanded His creature, under pain of punishment, that which He willed to command him, demanding of him his obedience for the pure and simple good, merit, advantage and glory of obedience.** » According to the aforesaid Servant of God, it is totally the fault of Satan, whose « **statement is intended, he said, to destroy the truth about the God of the Covenant, about the God who creates out of love, who out of love concludes a Covenant with humanity in the person of Adam, and who out of love lays upon man requirements that apply to the very essence and on the very reason of man** »

Thus, according to this exegesis, love excludes any law that would exceed what "*the very essence of man*" under the control of "*reason*" demands. This amounts to making authority a sin, and disobedience a natural and virtuous reaction to any trampling on the liberty of man by God or anyone else.

The result is that obedience, submission, and adoration are three demands falsely attributed to God by Satan, according to the aforesaid Servant of God. He explains: « *The God of the Covenant is effectively presented to the woman as a Sovereign who is jealous of the mystery of His absolute rule. He is presented as an adversary of man against whom man needs to rebel.* » (P. 57)

This would have created a tragic "misunderstanding", which has traversed all of history down to us, according to the aforesaid Servant of God: « *One might say that here we are at the beginning of the temptation of man, the beginning of a long process that will unfurl itself throughout history.* » (p. 50)

Today, this trick of the Devil explains modern atheism, and has pitted modern man against God since the birth of humanism. Fortunately, this misunderstanding, according to the aforesaid Servant of God, was dispelled by Second Vatican Council when it solemnly proclaimed « *the fully legitimate autonomy of human society and science* ».

Far from having to submit, men in our times therefore are right to demand an autonomy that the aforesaid Servant of God declares to be in keeping with the will of the Creator.

Nevertheless, it must be recognised that this condemna-

tion of the autonomy of man in the world, which the aforesaid Servant of God attributes to Satan, was the unchanging Catholic doctrine until Pius XII!

This is how the aforesaid Servant of God sacrifices the traditional Catholic religion to its modern antithesis, atheist humanism. He has this “speculative Good Friday” followed by a “dialectical Holy Saturday”, of a « descent into Hell » in order to « dialogue » with atheists. To André Frossard, the aforesaid Servant of God stated: « *If the situation of man in the modern world – and above all in certain circles of civilisation – is such that his faith, let us say his secular faith (sic) in humanism, science and progress is collapsing, there is surely opportunity to tell this man about the God of Jesus Christ, the God of the Covenant, and the God of the Gospel, quite simply (this “quite simply” is of an incredible density, the Abbé de Nantes commented) in order that he may recover thereby (through faith in God, in Jesus Christ, and in the Gospel) the fundamental and definitive meaning of his humanity, that is to say, the proper meaning of humanism, science and progress, which he does not doubt, and which he does not cease to regard as his earthly task and vocation.* » (*Be not Afraid*, p. 273).

Is it not also Cardinal Wojtyła who declared: « *It is very important that we realise just how far a **reinterpretation of the Gospel** (we emphasis the avowal of an incompatibility with the traditional, and therefore true interpretation of the Gospel) opens up new ways of teaching. Christians have the duty to fashion the face of the earth and to make life more human. It is their duty to give what is called social progress its true meaning.* » (Blazynski, *John Paul II. A Man from Cracow*, éditions Stock, 1979, p. 253)

Consequently, this affirmation from his first encyclical, *Redemptor hominis* is not surprising: « *The missionary attitude always begins with a feeling of deep esteem for “what is in man”.* » The aforesaid Servant of God refers to John 2.25. Yet, if we refer to this passage of the fourth Gospel, we must remark that Jesus, far from showing such esteem for men, « *did not trust Himself to them, because He knew all men and needed no one to bear witness of man; for He Himself knew what was in man* ».

In order to make his « *faith in man* » agree with Scripture, the aforesaid Servant of God is forced to misinterpret it.

In “*Sign of Contradiction*”, one can also read: « *The glory of God is the living man! And God leads him towards glory... This glory is what God wishes above all. Only He has the power to reveal the glory of the creature, to reveal the glory of man in the mirror of His Truth, and consequently in the dimensions of the final Fulfilment... The glory of God is the living man.* » (p. 231) »

The Abbé de Nantes commented: « **Here at last is the synthesis of the old Religion and of contemporary Atheism. It is their final fulfilment in living Man, rich in having and in being, brought to completion in the feeling of the sacredness of his existence and in the glory of his freedom. Man and God are reconciled, but in Man. St. Irenaeus, understood it quite differently; the recon-**

ciliation he had in mind was not in Man but in God: “The glory of God is that man might live. And the life of man is the vision of God” (Adv. haer. IV, 20.5-7)! Here man depends entirely on God and on His grace, and not on his own freedom and on his own pride! Between the two there is all the difference between a religion and its opposite, between the worship and love of God leading to the sacrifice of oneself and to death on the cross, and the worship and exaltation of self to the death of God and the obliteration of Jesus Christ. » (*Liber accusationis* II, p. 81)

The justification and praise of contemporary humanism are expressed by the aforesaid Servant of God in idolatrous terms. The theocentrism of our holy Catholic religion gives way, in the heart and thought of the aforesaid Servant of God, to anthropocentrism; the cult of God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, gives way to the cult of man who makes himself god. This idolatry was expressed, for example, in the discourse delivered by the aforesaid Servant of God at UNESCO on 2 June 1980:

« *Man must be regarded in his entirety and his highest importance as a particular and autonomous value, bearing within himself the transcendence of the person. Man must be valued for himself alone and not for any other motive: only for himself. Furthermore, we must love man simply because he is man, and we must demand love for man by reason of the particular dignity that is his. All these claims made on behalf of man are integral to the message of Christ, despite what critical minds may have had to say on the subject or whatever various trends opposed to religion in general and Christianity in particular may have succeeded in doing.* »

In this same discourse, the aforesaid Servant of God declared that « *in the cultural domain, man is always the primary factor: man is the primordial and fundamental factor in culture... In thinking of all cultures, I wish to say here in Paris, at the seat of UNESCO, with respect and admiration, **Behold the man!*** »

The Abbé de Nantes called these words a « **blasphemy** ». It is indeed significant that our Holy Father Pope Benedict XVI, in his message addressed to UNESCO for the twenty-fifth anniversary of this memorable discourse of the aforesaid Servant of God, quoted this passage, but not this last sentence.

In the face of such a text, the theologian of the Catholic Counter-Reformation wondered:

« **Might this be an intellectual construction, intended to attract atheists, unbelievers and the indifferent to the Church, and might this be a way of showing that the Church is open to their problems, even though the eloquence is a little exaggerated?** » If that were so, « **it would be a lesser evil, but its total failure should be sufficient to call a halt to such an apologetic** ». It is legitimate, however, to wonder whether it is not more: « **A true passion, an obsession with the grandeur of man, for love of man and his success?** » « **If it is, the Abbé de Nantes announced to the aforesaid Servant of God in 1983, this humanism will occupy more and more of your heart and mind, and will**

take up more of your time and activity! It will be all the more serious in that you have ascended to the highest degree of the hierarchy of the Church. From that height, all that is given to man will be taken from God, and all that is kept for God will appear to have been refused to man, the rival of God. » (*Liber accusationis* II, p. 88)

In 1983, the Abbé de Nantes accused the aforesaid Servant of God of stifling religion. Seven years later, the aforesaid Servant of God himself admitted that « *The number of those who do not know Christ and do not belong to the Church is constantly on the increase. Indeed, since the end of the Council it has almost doubled.* » (*Redemptoris missionis*, 7 December 1990, no 3)

CHRISTOLOGICAL ERROR: JESUS CHRIST UNITED TO ALL MEN

This anthropological error concerning the transcendence of man is coupled with a Christological error, the gravity of which cannot escape the tribunal: making use of the duality of natures in the one Person of Jesus of our Catholic Faith, the aforesaid Servant of God, by virtue of the “communication of idioms”, ascribes the attributes of the divine nature of Christ to his human nature, in order to then consider that they are proper to it, and thus to every man.

Assuredly, the aforesaid Servant of God often concealed the newness of this thought by quoting a sentence from paragraph 22 of the conciliar Constitution *Gaudium et spes* according to which « *by His incarnation the Son of God has united Himself in some fashion with every man* ». This sentence, however, was introduced into the conciliar schema at the proposal of the aforesaid Servant of God, then Archbishop of Cracow. By continually quoting *Gaudium et spes* 22, 2, for want of being able to find the least support for such an idea in the Holy Scriptures or in the Fathers of the Church, the aforesaid Servant of God was therefore quoting himself!

Thus it is in the encyclical *Redemptor hominis*, where the reference appears four times.

The tribunal will remark that in no 13 the restriction “*in some fashion*” has disappeared:

« *Jesus Christ has united himself with each one for ever through the mystery of the Redemption.* »

The aforesaid Servant of God confuses nature and grace, human life and divine life, the one being “*in some fashion*” present in the other, according to him, in everyone and for ever, as he clearly repeats in paragraph 14: « *Christ is in some fashion united with each man without any exception whatever, even when he is unaware of it.* »

The absence of any condition for the union of all to Christ, and thus for the salvation of all, leads to affirming it as given to all, without distinction of religion. « *The redemption event brings salvation to all* », the aforesaid Servant of God wrote in his encyclical *Redemptoris Missio*, quoting in support of this statement his inaugural encyclical *Redemptor*

hominis: « *For each one is included in the mystery of the Redemption, and with each one Christ has united Himself forever through this mystery.* »

We can affirm that this thought governed the entire pontificate of the aforesaid Servant of God, right down to his last Apostolic Letter, *Mane nobiscum* of 7 October 2004, instituting the Year of the Eucharist:

« *In Him, the Incarnate Word, both the mystery of God and the mystery of man are revealed. Because in Christ human nature was assumed, not absorbed, by that very fact this nature has been elevated in us to a matchless dignity. For by His incarnation the Son of God has united Himself in some fashion with every man.* » (G. S. 22.2)

A MODERNIST FAITH:

RELIGION IS THE FRUIT OF A NATURAL SENTIMENT THAT IS DISPENSED TO ALL HUMANS

From the union of these two errors – anthropological and Christological – results what the Abbé de Nantes calls an “Idealist Pasch”, following the “Speculative Good Friday” and the “Dialectical Holy Saturday”: according to the doctrine of the aforesaid Servant of God, it is through the acceptance of humanism, atheism and materialism in all their rigour, that the Church will save her Faith amidst a world that rejects her.

It needs only to be pointed out that the said Faith, which the aforesaid Servant of God claims to reconcile with contemporary humanism, is a Modernist faith, the fruit of the spontaneous and universal creation of the deepest human sentiment.

As an example of this Modernism, we can cite the interpretation of the aforesaid Servant of God considering the « *descent into Hell* » of Jesus Christ after His death on the Cross as a “*conception*”, and not an historical event. According to him, this article of our *Creed* is a pure metaphor referring not to a « *descent* » but to a rise « *to the fullness of the beatific vision of God* », which rather suggests an “*ascension*” (allocution at the audience of 11 January 1989)!

This explanation « **smacks of heresy** », Arian and Nestorian, which puts Christ into the same category as an ordinary human being, morally perfect, holy, and « *admitted* » only after His death to « *the fullness of the beatific vision of God* ». Unlike the teaching of the Church, according to which Jesus, Son of God, God Himself, enjoyed, from the first exercise of His human faculties, the beatific vision of His own deity, of His divine Being, of His personal identity. The Church forbids all contrary teaching and St. Thomas shows the reason for it in the existential union of the two natures, divine and human, in the Person of the Word.

« **Through such a union, the Christ-man is Himself blessed with uncreated beatitude, just as he is also God through this union. In addition, however, his human nature had to possess this particular created beatitude through which His soul was in possession of the ultimate end of His human nature.** » (III a, Question 9, article 2,

ad 2) This is why, beginning here below, « **His soul was raised up by a participated light from His divine nature to the perfection of the beatific knowledge that consists in the vision of God in His essence** » (ad 1).

Another example of the naturalisation of the supernatural: on 23 May 1984, at the Wednesday audience, the aforesaid Servant of God rejected the mystical interpretation of the Song of Songs, retaining only its erotic interpretation: « *The textual analysis of this Book forces us to place its contents outside the framework of the great prophetic analogy* » he declared.

The aforesaid Servant of God thus impugns the teaching of the holy ancient Jewish and unanimous Catholic tradition, as well as the scientific and mystical demonstrations, which interpret these poems as mystical dialogues between God and His people, between Christ and His Church, between the divine Bridegroom and the sinful soul of whom His grace had undertaken to make His spiritual spouse in view of blessed eternity.

The two errors – anthropological and Christological – of the aforesaid Servant of God, and his Modernist conception of the Faith explain, finally, his attitude towards the “other religions”.

On this subject, the tribunal will only have to re-read the discourse of the aforesaid Servant of God on 22 December 1986, addressed to the cardinals and the members of the Roman Curia for the exchange of greetings, in which the aforesaid Servant of God, imbued with the « *great event that was the prayer of all for Peace at Assisi* », was caught “in the act” of apostasy. This is why the Abbé de Nantes published a literal commentary of this discourse (CCR no 197, February 1987) that we add in annex, so well does it cast a light on the errors of the aforesaid Servant of God.

« **With John Paul II, the Abbé de Nantes wrote, the Church is still the “sign” of the close union of all with God and of the unity of the human race in its members, all brothers together. She is no longer the “sacrament” of that unity. It is “the whole human race” without any prerequisite conversion or entry into the Church, which is seen to possess a satisfying union with God and unity among its members.** » (*ibid.*)

« **Of course, the Abbé de Nantes continued, there was “not the least shade of confusion or syncretism” at Assisi. There was much worse. In this carnivalesque and out-of-date procession of all the afro-asiatic folklore, there was a suicidal obliteration of Christ and of His Church.** »

II. AGAINST THE VIRTUE OF HOPE

In a word, we could say that during his long pontificate, Pope John Paul II turned Christian hope away from the Kingdom of God towards the city of men. Instead of showing us the path to Heaven, he endeavoured to rally us to the construction of a more just world here below. To be convinced of this, the tribunal will have only to read carefully the allocution of 16 March 1991 addressed to the Pontifical Council for Inter-religious dialogue that was debating “*the pursuit of christian happiness and faith*”.

When the aforesaid Servant of God justified this meeting of Assisi by a quotation from the Gospel of St. John: « *The Lord offered His life “not for the nation only, but to gather into one the children of God who are scattered abroad”* » (Jn 11.52), the Abbé de Nantes protested against « **another abusive quotation from Holy Scripture to support a heresy that could not be more contrary to it. Our Lord died on the Cross so that all, Jews and pagans, abandoning their age-old “ignorance” or “perfidy” might yield to the prompting of Truth and enter into the one, holy Church.** » (*ibid*)

While re-reading this discourse, we cannot imagine the members of the tribunal, in turn, not protesting with the Abbé de Nantes when they read no 11, in which the aforesaid Servant of God « **propounds a hypothesis in a tone of certitude, as though it were the result of long reflection on the Scriptures and Tradition:** “*We may indeed believe that every authentic prayer is prompted by the Holy Spirit*”... **but he does not say what an “authentic” prayer is, and by means of a relative pronoun he passes from the hypothetical to the categorical:** “*the Holy Spirit who is mysteriously present in the heart of every man*” (...). **Thus the words of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans, which are explicitly concerned with Christians only (Catholics obviously: Lutherans and Calvinists were not concerned as they did not yet exist!) are said of every human individual, assuring each and everyone of the grace and all possible favours from God the Father who cannot resist the “unspeakable groanings” of the Holy Spirit!** » (*ibid.*)

Persevering in his errors, the aforesaid Servant of God religiously kissed the Koran on 14 May 1999. On Sunday, 6 May of the year 2000, after having ritually removed his shoes, he entered into the mosque of the Umayyads at Damascus, in order to listen to the reading of the verses of the Koran, and the litany of the names of Allah, followed by the homily of the great mufti affirming that « *Islam is the religion of brotherhood and peace* », and that « *we all adore the same God* ». The aforesaid Servant of God thereby reinforced a billion Muslims in their “faith” in the Koran, according to which God does not have a son.

These few quotations and facts, chosen from among a thousand, constitute a sample sufficient to establish the adulteration of the purity of the Catholic Faith of the aforesaid Servant of God, marring his teaching with errors that are serious enough to compromise definitively his reputation for holiness. It is nevertheless necessary to pursue our analysis by showing that the aforesaid Servant of God also gravely infringed the virtue of hope.

In this discourse can be found « **the most beautiful, the richest, the most delightful, and also the most mysterious** » **Christian words**, the Abbé de Nantes acknowledged. **But the religion of the new and eternal Covenant in the Blood of Jesus Christ, which is historical, real, unique and holy, apostolic and Catholic, is totally absent from it. Worse yet, it is excluded! There is no divine and conditional Covenant, no revealed Law, no adoration, no worship of God. One finds no conversion, no faith, no bap-**

tism. There is no cross, no sacrifice, no justification, no grant of grace. One sees mention of no Church, no sacraments; no confession, no Communion. There is no Heaven, no Hell, still less any mention of Purgatory. One reads of no particular or general judgment, no good or bad angels, no saints of Paradise, no devotions to the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary. The poor Virgin Mary is forgotten. Worse yet, She is excluded... » What remains then? « The Call to a formless, unconditional and unlimited love, as love in God is assumed to be, and the offer of a joy in Jesus Christ that is promised, as soon as it is accepted, without having to make any effort. It is a present and perpetual beatitude based on the certainty of a universal resurrection. » (CRC no 273, May 1991, p. 10)

This is why the Abbé de Nantes spoke of the « **Wojtylan gnosis** ». Based on the errors against the Faith denounced above, this “gnosis” undermines the theological virtue of supernatural hope by emptying Hell and Heaven of all concrete reality, in order to call for the construction of a new world on the occasion of the third millennium.

HELL DOES EXIST, BUT IT CONTAINS NO ONE

Due to the fact that « *by His incarnation the Son of God has united Himself in some fashion with every man* », does He accompany him into Hell? Of course not! the aforesaid Servant of God concludes from this that quite probably, there is no one in Hell. For example, in his book “Enter into Hope”

« *The possibility of eternal damnation is certainly proclaimed in the Gospel with no possible ambiguity* », he recognises. « *But to what degree is it actually realised in the afterlife?* » To this question the aforesaid Servant of God replies with another question: « *If God desires that all men be saved, if God, for this reason offered His Son who, in turn, acts in the Church through the Holy Spirit, can man be damned, can he be rejected by God? From time immemorial, the question of Hell has preoccupied the great thinkers of the Church, from Origen to Mikhaïl Boulgakov and Hans Urs von Balthasar. The first Councils rejected the theory called the final apocatastasis, according to which the world, after its destruction, will be renewed and every creature will be saved; a theory that implicitly abolished Hell. The question, however, continues to be posed. God, who so loved man, can He accept that he reject Him and for this reason be condemned to unending torments? Yet, the words of Christ are unequivocal. In Matthew, He speaks clearly of those who will experience eternal punishment.*

Who will these be? The Church has never wanted to take a position. There is an impenetrable mystery between the holiness of God and the human conscience. The silence of the Church is thus the only appropriate attitude. »

In saying this, Pope John Paul II cast doubt on the statements of Sister Lucy according to whom the Virgin Mary did not adopt this “appropriate attitude” at Fatima on 13 July 1917, by showing to Lucy, Francisco and Jacinta « **Hell where poor sinners go** », a vision that is well attested

if only by the shriek of fright that Lucy let out, which was heard by the witnesses of this third apparition.

« *Our Lady opened Her hands again, as She had done the two previous months. The reflection (of the light) seemed to penetrate the earth and we saw what looked like a vast ocean of fire. Plunged in this fire we saw demons and souls (of the damned). The latter were like transparent burning embers, black or bronzed, having human form. They were floating in this fire, lifted up by the flames that issued from within themselves, along with clouds of smoke. They fell back on all sides, like sparks in huge fires, without weight or equilibrium, amid cries and groans of pain and despair that were horrifying to hear and made us tremble with fright. (It must have been this sight that caused me to let out a great shriek, as heard by the people around me). The demons could be distinguished (from the souls of the damned) by their horrible and repellent likeness to frightening and unknown animals, but they were transparent like burning black coals.* »

« *This vision lasted but an instant, thanks to our good Mother in Heaven who, during the first apparition, had promised to take us to Heaven. Were it not for this, I believe we would have died of fear and terror.* »

We should not be surprised that the aforesaid Servant of God totally disregards this vision, since he denies the certain damnation of Judas:

« *Even if Christ said of Judas who had just betrayed him: “It would be better for that man if he had never been born” this sentence must not be understood as eternal damnation.* »

May the tribunal also remark that in the encyclical *Dives in Misericordia*, John Paul II misrepresents the parable of the prodigal son (Lk 15.11-32) in order to recognise an alleged right of man to divine mercy because he is son of God, not through adoption, not through grace received at baptism, but through a bond of nature:

« *The fidelity of the father to himself, he wrote, is entirely centred on the humanity of the lost son, on his dignity. This above all explains the joyous emotion of the moment of his return home. Going further, one can say that his love for this son, the love that springs from the very essence of fatherhood, obliges the father to have concern for the dignity of his son.* » (no 6)

HEAVEN IS NOT A PLACE

If the aforesaid Servant of God wrongly taught us not to fear Hell, he did not inspire the desire for Heaven.

We invite the tribunal to re-read the Wednesday allocutions of 1989. The aforesaid Servant of God was finishing a regular commentary on the *Creed*, article after article, which had begun in January 1982. We have already seen above how on 11 January 1982, he explained that the descent into Hell was a « *metaphorical representation* » that « *proclaims the beginning of the glorification of Christ* » who was finally admitted to the « *fullness of the beatific vision* ».

If the following two allocutions clearly affirm the Resurrection of Jesus coming out of the tomb, thus condemning the Modernist deniers of this historical truth, on the other hand, in the first three allocutions of the month of April, the aforesaid Servant of God came to deny the physical fact of the bodily Ascension of Jesus into Heaven. According to him, the Ascension is not a local translation of the Risen Jesus, from earth into some *Heaven*, but His « *complete and definitive abstraction from the laws of time and space* ». « **In other words**, the Abbé de Nantes commented, ***His dematerialisation.*** »

After which, the tribunal will certainly be surprised to notice that the Wednesday allocutions change subject, without finishing the explication of the *Creed*, in which the commentator should have dealt with the physical reality of Heaven and Hell!

Let us remark, however, that the Catechism of the Catholic Church that was published under the authority of the aforesaid Servant of God, and that teaches his *conception* of the Ascension (nos 645-646, 659), does not make either Heaven or Hell a place (nos 1027-1033), but only a *state*. On the contrary, the *Compendium* published by Pope Benedict XVI reintroduces the notion of place (nos 209 et 212) by referring to the elect « *gathered around Jesus and Mary, the Angels and the saints* » (no 209). Knowing that the risen Jesus and His divine Mother are raised body and soul into the glory of Heaven, « **Their mutual presence**, the Abbé de Nantes wrote, **necessarily constitutes a space, inaugurates a place, called Heaven or Paradise, the blessed abode of the elect.** »

THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW WORLD HERE BELOW, FOR THE YEAR 2000

If the aforesaid Servant of God only had abstruse words for speaking of Heaven, on the other hand he put all his immense intellectual capacities and his charisma at the service of the utopia of a world of peace through universal democracy of which the Church would be the spiritual animator. « **Breaking with Catholic morality, with the honour of civilised peoples and with the immemorial rules of papal diplomacy**, the Abbé de Nantes observed, **John Paul II has not come out against this revolutionary uprising with a trade-union pretext and a religious mask. He has not, like his valiant predecessors of the last century, demanded that the peoples submit to the powers that be, and ordered the Church to co-operate with the State either in Poland or anywhere else in the world. He has not reserved his solicitude for the salvation of souls and public tranquillity, but has wasted it on the doubtful causes of justice, human rights and freedom** » (CCR no 145, p. 4)

The encyclical "*Sollicitudo rei socialis*", of 30 December 1987, offers a flagrant example of this. The aforesaid Servant of God makes it a duty for everyone « *to commit himself to the development of peoples* »:

« *It is an imperative that obliges each and every man and woman, as well as societies and nations. In particular, it*

obliges the Catholic Church and the other Churches and Ecclesial Communities, with which we are completely willing to collaborate in this field. »

To speak as Saint Pius X did in his *Letter on the sillon*, « ***we do not have to demonstrate that the "development of peoples" is of no concern to the action of the Church in the world*** »; what is important for it, on the other hand, is to lead the peoples, « *each and every man and woman* », if it is possible, to the happiness of Heaven.

In this respect, Cardinal Ratzinger, in a recent book speaks in the manner of St. Pius X: « ***In this world*** [the emphasis is his], ***we must oppose the mirages of false philosophies and recognise that we do not live only on bread, but first of all on obedience to the Word of God. It is only there where this obedience is lived that the convictions grow that are apt to procure bread for all.*** » (*Roads towards Jesus*, éd. Paroles et Silence, p. 93)

This Catholic thought of the future Benedict XVI is poles apart from the gnostic unanimism of the aforesaid Servant of God, according to whom, « *in this pursuit of the integral development of man we can also do much with the members of other religions* » (*Sollicitudo rei socialis*).

This is to say that in the « *integral development of man* », the aforesaid Servant of God does not include entry into Heaven, in order to take one's place at the wedding-feast of the Lamb! His naturalistic application of the parable of the evil rich man and the poor Lazarus to economic and social life confirms it for us:

« *It is essential, as the encyclical Populorum Progressio already asked* », he declared in the encyclical *Sollicitudo rei socialis* « *to recognise the equal right of each people "to be seated at the table of the common banquet"* [of the goods of this world] ***instead of lying outside the door like Lazarus, while "the dogs come and lick his sores"*** (cf. Lk 16.21). » (no 33)

Already, on 2 June 1980, parodying the words of Jesus in the desert, the aforesaid Servant of God had openly proclaimed at the headquarters of UNESCO: « *Man does not live by bread alone, but also by culture.* » By replacing « ***all the words that proceed from the mouth of God*** », by *culture*, the aforesaid Servant of God shows that his "religion" is reduced to the sole *cultural* function of contribution. Or, to be more precise, « *it strives to contribute the supernatural component to human cultural elaboration.* » (*discours at Camerino*, 19 March 1991).

Far from being « *supernatural* », the so-called « *component* » is purely natural, according to the aforesaid Servant of God. In order to convince oneself of this, it suffices to acquaint oneself with his discourse to the diplomatic corps on 10 January 1998. In it he reveals his ambition of becoming the *mentor* of all the peoples of the world, as the best « *expert in humanity* », dealing with all their problems by appealing to the ideology of the rights of man, of his liberty, of his cult; but the orator does not say a word in it about his own religion!

The discourse of the aforesaid Servant of God at Funchal on the feast of the Ascension 1991 is just as convincing:

« *Thus, the Ascension of the Lord is not a simple departure, the Abbé de Nantes summarised. It is first of all the beginning of a new presence and of a new saving action*... those of the Spirit, who “gives divine strength to the earthly life of humanity in the visible Church”. As quickly as it is recalled, however, this limit of the visible Church is overturned. The fullness of “all the restored creation”, the “new creation of the world and of man” that “we celebrate in the Sunday Eucharist”, fills “the Church and the world” without further difference and without condition. Here we find this gnostic unanimism in which the dilution of the Body of Christ is total and definitive, while humanity and even the material world assume their stature of “Body” at the breath of the “Spirit”; and this will be the second Coming of Christ, in the Age of the Spirit, which will soon appear.

« *The Ascension of the Lord is, in the light of the liturgy of today, the Pope concluded, the solemnity of maturation [of whom? of what? do not try to guess: of everything that is not Christ, but that becomes Him...] in the Holy Spirit for the fullness of Christ.*” Thus there is no longer, in any Paradise, a true and living Man-God Jesus Christ, in the flesh, in company of His glorious Mother assumed into Heaven, nor any real Presence in any Mass. There is no longer any coming to expect of this Christ Saviour, other than that of the year 2000, “the second and definitive Coming of Christ the Saviour”:

« *Thus the new man in dignity, in contemplation and in adoration, approaches God with confidence, in a great feast of all restored creation. We celebrate the renewed splendour of the full goodness [sic] of the world in God: the risen Christ, in His infinite grace, frees man of his limits. Pasch is the new creation of the world and of man* » (CRC no 273, May 1991, p. 16)

Under the pontificate of the aforesaid Servant of God, the Church had as the sole aim of all her works « *to bring her own contribution to the preparation of men who will enter into the new millennium* ».

Objecting to « *the “prophets of woe”, ready to see catastrophes everywhere* », the aforesaid Servant of God paid homage to « *the prestigious objectives that were reached* » as so many « *moments on the road of man at the threshold of the year 2000* »: the conquest of space, nuclear energy, genetics, computer science, robotics (*discours at Camerino*, 19 March 1991)...

All of these conquests, according to the aforesaid Servant of God, lead the Church to realise « *that she is living a phase that is among the most innovative of history* », owing to the extension of the « *very concept of culture* ». Now, as man must nourish himself not only from the « *bread earned through the work of his hands... but also through the bread of science and progress, of civilisation and culture* » (*Laborem exercens*, I), in this profusion of « *forms of multicultural societies that go beyond the traditional geographical and political borders* », the Church has only one

thought: « *In the light of God, to assert the primacy of man!* »

Indeed, in the year 2000, the aforesaid Servant of God thought he would inaugurate a new era, definitive in his thought, a new civilisation. On 26 March 2000, he went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem with this intention. He celebrated its first “station” on the ancient esplanade of the Jewish Temple, which has become the esplanade of the Dome of the Rock, the “memorial”, according to the Koran, « *consecrated so that men may faithfully return there and celebrate the “Site of Abraham” with prayers* » (Sura II, verse 125).

Let us point out that, indeed, the plan of the aforesaid Servant of God presents an extraordinary resemblance to that of the author of the Koran, which is to restore the « *perfect* » (‘*islâm*) religion born of Abraham, and to substitute it for Judaism and Christianity that are in perpetual conflict with one another!

The aforesaid Servant of God therefore formulated this wish that « *the All-Powerful might bring peace to this entire beloved region, so that all peoples dwelling there might enjoy their rights, live in harmony and cooperation, and give witness to the one God in an act of goodness and human solidarity* » (quoted in *Resurrection* no 1, January 2001, p. 11)

Even though, since then, violence has only increased in the region, as was foreseeable because « *without Me, you can do nothing* », as Our Lord said, the aforesaid Servant of God persevered in his hope for a world of peace without the necessary recourse to Christ. Yet, He alone is our Peace, the tribunal will agree, and He entrusted to His divine Mother this office, as She taught us during Her apparitions at Fatima, in which the aforesaid Servant of God nevertheless showed interest following the attack on him.

The second “station” of the pontifical pilgrimage was the Wailing Wall, where the aforesaid Servant of God went to deposit the text of the repentance (*teshouva*) of the Church regarding the Jewish people and to touch with his palm the stone of the “*Qotel*”, the western Wall that supported the Temple of Jerusalem, wherein resided the « *presence* » of the living God until its destruction in 70 by the Romans.

The aforesaid Servant of God thus behaved as the successor of Peter... before he « *recovered* » from his denial and invited the « *men of Israel* » to repent and be baptised « *in the name of Jesus Christ* » for the remission of their sins, in order to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit: « *For the promise, he told them, is made to you and to your children and to all those far off, whomever the Lord our God will call.* » (Ac 2.38-40)

In 2001, the aforesaid Servant of God went to Greece, Syria and Malta, « *in the footsteps of St. Paul* ». At Damascus, in a formerly Christian church, which has been transformed into a mosque, he declared to his Muslim hosts: « *Our meeting in this renowned place reminds us that man is a spiritual being, called to acknowledge and respect the ab-*

solute priority of God in all things. » He did not say: « **of Christ who is God** », as a true disciple of the author of the Koran but not of St. Paul who, as soon as he was converted on the road to Damascus, « **began at once to preach Jesus in the synagogues, proclaiming that he is the Son of God** » (Ac 9.20).

« *It is my ardent hope, he continued, that Muslim and Christian religious leaders and teachers will present our two great religious communities as communities engaged in a respectful dialogue, and never again as communities in conflict.* »

Thus we must “*never again*” speak of Jesus Christ as the Son of God.

III. AGAINST THE VIRTUE OF CHARITY

The « **Wojtylian gnosis** », the guiding thought of which we have just expounded, is so alien to the doctrine and the age-old life of the Church that it cannot be professed without finding oneself in opposition of mind and heart, if not always in outward attitude, to those who remain attached to the Church, to her truth, to her supernatural life. The break with the truth causes a break in the bonds of charity among Christians.

We will only take into consideration three pieces of evidence for the prosecution against the aforesaid Servant of God, among so many others already recorded in 1983 by the Abbé de Nantes in his *Book of Accusation*. The first piece of evidence concerns the attitude of the aforesaid Servant of God towards those who criticised him; the second concerns his attitude towards the children of the Church who are persecuted in hatred for the faith; the third concerns his attitude towards the adversaries of the Church.

CONTEMPT FOR OPPONENTS THROUGH THE ABSENCE OF CONCERN FOR THE GOOD OF SOULS

On 4 October, the Abbé de Nantes wrote to the aforesaid Servant of God this letter, the level-headedness of which the tribunal will assess. It attests to a sense of the Church, and to a filial attitude that expects all from its supreme Pastor:

« **Most Holy Father,**

« **May I, the least of the faithful of the Church, be permitted to address myself as a last resort to the Supreme Pastor, the Servant of the servants of God, in order to ask him to say clearly what the exact conditions are for “ful” membership of the Roman Catholic Church, or else what offences exclude one from membership? My friends and I are unable to learn from anyone whether we are still your sons, in the one fold of Christ, or whether we have been cast out and why? And if we are cast out, what are the conditions to which we have to subscribe in order to recover our place and all our rights?**

« **Certainly, we are opposed with all our mind, with all our heart and with all our strength to this so-called reform of the Church which, departing from the mandatory paths of faith, morality and the great Catholic disci-**

During the pontificate of the aforesaid Servant of God the Church, without supernatural hope, became a movement for the spiritual animation of universal democracy. We can legitimately wonder whether the words of Jesus Christ: « **But when the Son of Man comes, will He find faith on earth?** » (Lk 18.8) are not being fulfilled before our eyes.

In any case, the reputation for holiness of the aforesaid Servant of God can no longer be upheld!

All the more so because if his faith was tainted with error, if his hope was not oriented by the Cross of Christ that opens Heaven to sinners, it is logical that authentic charity would be seriously lacking in him.

pline, is the cause of her decadence and of her auto-demolition. We know that our opposition is not pleasing to the prophets and promoters of this gigantic overturning of all our traditions and Christian life.

« **We are not aware, however, of having failed in the sacred demands of Catholic Faith and morality; on the contrary, it is for having served and defended them that we have been led to oppose those who attack and mock them openly, copiously, and with impunity. Those, on the other hand, who invoke the conciliar reform in order to cover their aberrant liturgical practices or explicit denials of the divine mysteries, are struck with neither suspension nor disqualification; they are taken to be of the Church and excellent apostles whilst we are held to be excluded from the Catholic community and bad Christians.**

« **In order to be in communion with Rome, is it necessary to cease holding the dogmas and moral code recalled by Paul VI himself, or do we have to applaud every new opinion and option, disconcerting though they be, of the last popes and of the last Council? It would be a strange reversal!**

« **We make bold to await from Your Holiness a judgement worthy of his high mission, worthy of his inalienable responsibility as infallible Doctor and Supreme Pastor, obliging us all, the Catholic faithful, to hold the Catholic Faith while allowing us to diverge from the opinions and options of innovators, however highly placed or numerous they may be, provided that charity remains amongst us all : *In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas.* »**

The Abbé de Nantes then recalled all the steps he had taken since May 1978 for a reconciliation. He continued:

« **Most Holy Father, we do not ask to be pardoned, excused or flattered. We ask for the Truth and we venture to think that there is no greater charity nor better service for our souls than to tell us the Truth : are we still, just as we are and express ourselves in the uprightness of our conscience, living members of the Holy Roman Catholic Church, or does our opposition to the present reform banish us from the Church absolutely?**

« It seems to us very grave and even pernicious that the Church, a visible and hierarchical society should efface her boundaries, pull down her ramparts, admitting to her communion members of Christian communities only recently still reputed to be schismatic and heretical, even admitting the faithful of monotheistic and certainly antichristian religions, whilst at the same time erecting walls within, inventing and creating divisions and illusory segregations based on disputed opinions or uncertain orientations.

« It is because we recognise in You, Most Holy Father, the Supreme Authority, and not just the honour of primacy, but its full responsibility and duty, that we beg You to define the frontiers of the Church, outside which there is no salvation, as vast as possible for Your mercy, outside which no one can feel secure and should be warned to amend or be converted as soon as possible in order to escape the Wrath of God.

« And we believe that we can say, contrary to what is put about here and there even in Rome in order to slander us, that in defining with the extraordinary solemnity and power of his infallible Magisterium what is the truth of the Faith in all controversial matters, such as ecumenism, religious liberty and human rights, and in anathematising what is heresy, Your Holiness will find in us and in all those who take their convictions from us, your most respectful and obedient sons.

« Deign to accept, Your Holiness, the religious homage of our entire and sincere fidelity. »

The Abbé de Nantes immediately published this pressing and moving petition, in an editorial in the Catholic Counter-Reformation of October 1979. He accompanied it with the following commentary, entitled "*The Meaning of this action*".

« The Church cannot live in the bonds of charity without conserving her unity of Faith. For want of a clear definition and an absolute respect for the Catholic Faith, all common life proves impossible, as we see today. It is the primordial duty of the hierarchical Church, for the salvation of our souls and the subsistence of the infallible Magisterium of the Church, to guard and transmit the deposit of Christ intact and whole until the end of time, speaking the truth and proscribing error. For certain, this is the first service we are entitled to expect of a Pope and we must solicit him, at the risk of appearing importunate, until at last we obtain it infallibly from his paternity.

« It is fifteen years now that Fr. Hans Kung and the signatory of this present letter have both been held, though unequally, suspect in the Church. Strangely, everything that the first contests and refuses to accept, the second accepts with all his soul as divine truth. The fact is that what displeases Hans Kung relates strictly to the ordinary Magisterium of the Church and often touches the infallibility of her solemn Magisterium.

« On the other hand everything that greatly pleases Hans Kung in the teaching of Second Vatican Council and of Pope Paul VI and John Paul II, appears to us as absolutely unacceptable, foreign to Scripture and Tradition, but all inspired by the principles of modern society, of its philosophical rationalism, of its atheist humanism and its revolutionary spirit. Now, all this, to which our popes and bishops attach such great importance, still only relates to their views and options as private theologians. At least so it seems to us.

« It appears that popes and councils can err on secondary points. Kung says so, and with that he authorises himself to reject the mysteries of the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, the Redemption and the historical reality of the Resurrection, not to mention Christian morality. And he is allowed to glory in his immunity within the Church.

« With Paul VI, we make profession of the Catholic Faith; we adhere to his Creed as we do to all his absolutely traditional moral teaching. We contest, however, his cult of man, his universal ecumenism and his theory of religious liberty, opinions unheard of on the part of a pope. Yet our free criticism of these secondary points is not tolerated; it has earned us suspension and disqualification within the Church!

« There needs to be clarity in ideas as well as order restored to the Church, so that through divine truth and human justice we may again find ourselves united in a sincere and profound charity – that is our most ardent desire. Now who can do that, apart from the Pope? Who better than His Holiness John Paul II himself to do it? It is to him that we appeal and with the help of God we shall not be confounded. »

On 8 October 1979, the nunciature at Paris informed the Abbé de Nantes that his letter to the Holy Father was going to be « transmitted to its high destination ». During the following months, however, no reply came from Rome. Thus it was during the entire pontificate of the aforesaid Servant of God: none of the petitions of the Abbé de Nantes ever received the least response from their august addressee, but always blunt refusals coming from Vatican offices.

The deliberate will of the aforesaid Servant of God to refuse to carry through to a conclusion the examination of the accusations of the Abbé de Nantes, despite the prescriptions of Canon Law, was for his collaborators so obvious that during his pontificate numerous illegal acts of the authorities, official "*declarations*", warnings from the bishops and sanctions prior to any inquiry or trial, succeeded one another without fear of reprobation.

These acts caused considerable, indeed irreparable, harm to the reputation of the Abbé de Nantes and of the countless other persons who supported him, contrary to all presumption of innocence. Nevertheless, the right to a good reputation is a fundamental right recognised to all the faithful of the Catholic Church, and particularly to clerics, not in virtue of the dignity and the rights of man, but in virtue of the dignity of our condition as baptised persons, which makes us

« *not children of a servant* » but of « *the free woman* » who is the Church (Ga 4.31). Is it not the duty of the Common Father to attend to the good reputation of each of his children?

If the accusations of the Abbé de Nantes were untrue, seriously inaccurate, why not give the readers of the Catholic Counter-Reformation – the readership of which totalled thirty-six thousand at the time! – the charity of a trial in due form according to the law of the Church, as the Abbé de Nantes demanded. If he were guilty, it was necessary to show it in order to obtain his recantation, and to enlighten the numerous readers of his articles. In a similar, although much less serious, situation, Saint Pius X acted quickly and efficiently with the former chancellor of the episcopal curia of Belluno, Don Angelo Volpe, who was sanctioned with interdict by his bishop because he publicly opposed the pontifical position on the *Roman Question*: the holy Pontiff wanted to meet with him personally, discussed with him and found a formula of agreement. A few days later, the banned priest again approached the altar. This is because Pius X was a saint and he had nothing with which to reproach himself.

Entirely different was the case of the aforesaid Servant of God, only concerned with saving his reputation. A short anecdote shows it indisputably. In 1993, Mgr Sandri, then an assessor at the Secretariat of State, granted me an audience that was requested with a view to undertaking talks concerning the complaint of the Abbé de Nantes against the Author of the Catechism of the Catholic Church. This prelate made the formidable admission: « ***If we did what you asked [namely to introduce this trial] it would mean that it all has a fundus veritatis, a basis of truth. If we began to examine, that in itself would mean that you are right. We cannot do this.*** » Must not the aforesaid Servant of God and his services have been truly convinced that they could not prove the Abbé de Nantes guilty of error! For, each day in the world and in the Church large numbers of complaints are examined – well-founded or unfounded. It is the unfolding of the trial that establishes the legitimacy of a complaint, and not its opening!

Then, without regard for the slander levelled against the person of the Abbé de Nantes with the sole aim of silencing him, the aforesaid Servant of God closed his ears and his heart to all the recourses, seriously neglecting the charity owed to this priest and to those who were following him, and showing himself to be more attached to his own doctrine than to truth, the basis of charity.

THE BETRAYAL OF THE UNIATE MARTYRS

While John Paul II was mobilising his diplomatic services and the media to attract the attention of the world to the liberation movements of certain countries like Nicaragua, South Africa and Palestine, he showed the greatest indifference towards the persecuted Ukrainians.

One of the rare acts of the aforesaid Servant of God that provoked formal and public opposition from a member of the Sacred College shows how far the will for ecumenical reconciliation can lead, against all consideration of the truth.

The tribunal is not unaware of what unspeakable torments our Catholic Uniate brethren under the Communist yoke had to suffer because of their fidelity to the See of Rome. Out of fifty-four million Ukrainian Catholics, ten million died as a consequence of the persecutions. On 3 December 1980, the Synod of the Ukrainians that was held at Rome with the authorisation of the aforesaid Servant of God, published a *Pastoral Letter* proclaiming the nullity of the “*Synod of Lvov*” of 1946, convened without the approbation of Pius XII, which had proclaimed, under the duress of the Stalinist Communist power, the forced unification of the Catholic Church with Orthodoxy.

Now, on 22 December 1980, the Orthodox Patriarch of Moscow addressed to the aforesaid Servant of God a threatening letter enjoining him to disavow the *Pastoral Letter of the Roman Synod of the Uniates*, on penalty of creating « such dangerous tension that is could only be described as tragic, to judge from the destructive consequences it could lead to in relations between our two sister Churches », this final expression designating Rome and Moscow. The Catholic Uniate Church, especially the Ukrainian one, still suffered in the 1980's the yoke of the Communist power, the protector of the Patriarchate of Moscow!...

What did the aforesaid Servant of God do? He replied by a secret letter, dated 14 January 1981, in which he « *regrets such a publication that occurred without my having knowledge of these documents* ». He immediately informed, however, all the nunciatures of the countries in which Ukrainian Catholic communities live, that the *Pastoral Letter of the Roman Synod of the uniates* had not been approved and therefore lacked all official character. He also demanded that its publication be avoided and, as much as possible, its distribution. No organ of the Holy See alluded to it.

On 8 April 1981, however, the Patriarchate of Moscow published the secret letter of the aforesaid Servant of God the contents of which provoked the indignant anger of Joseph Cardinal Slipyj, the Ukrainian Archbishop Major of Lvov, a confessor of the Faith. He then publicly asked for explanations from the aforesaid Servant of God. Even when the newspaper *La Croix* gave an account of the communiqué of the cardinal, it was obliged to point out the dilemma: « Caught between the respect owed to the martyr of the Ukrainian Church and the desire for ecumenical progress with the Orthodox Churches, the Holy See has only a very narrow margin for action. » (CCR no 139, October 1981, p. 13)

A FLATTERER OF THE ENEMIES OF THE CHURCH

Even more than his scornful attitude towards the one who dared appeal to his sovereign authority against his own errors, even more than his indifference with regard to his brethren persecuted for their Faith, the depths of the heart of the aforesaid Servant of God revealed themselves when he invited the Catholic Church, the holy Church, to convert by repenting of her sins and errors, in his Apostolic Letter *Tertio millennio adveniente*, despite the opposition of certain cardinals. This immutable will clearly manifests the itch for

popularity of the aforesaid Servant of God, seeking the esteem of men, notwithstanding their contempt for their Saviour. It equally manifests his absence of veneration, of charity, for the holy Church.

As the Abbé de Nantes had already written to Pope Paul VI, « **the Innovators get carried away choosing and rejecting in the ecclesiastical traditions according to the lights of the individual conscience... and according to the present orientations of Authority. It is the world turned upside-down! If one must guard oneself against error and sin, it can only be against those of the present Church, and this can only be judged in relation to our holy traditions and age-old doctrines.** » (CRC no 2, p. 11)

This is why the sin of certain Catholics must not be attributed to the holy Church, which unceasingly struggles to continue the redeeming work of her Lord. When established, these sins are a weight for her, a cross that she carries united to her Bridegroom and Redeemer, without ever making them her own for all that; to ask forgiveness for them in the name of the Church tends to make it believed that she is responsible for them!

Furthermore, to attribute to her these “sins” on the strength of slanderous words of her enemies, to give them the slightest credit or, by one’s attitude, to give them a “basis of truth” (*fundus veritatis!*), is a sin against the holiness of the Church. In both cases, far from drawing souls to the Church, the *repentance* turns them away from her! Offensive to the holy Church, this action is a calamity for poor sinners; claiming to be a work of truth, its only effect is to maintain them in the darkness of error.

It is useless to draw up the list of these “repentances”; let us take only a few examples.

On 4 May 2001, at Athens, the Pope apologised to the Orthodox for all the « *massacres perpetrated by Catholics* », in particular during the sack of Constantinople in 1204, passing over in silence the obstacle that the Byzantines, schismatic since 1054, had opposed to the success of the Crusade, and their numerous betrayals in favour of the Turks and Saladin. Separated from Rome for questions of rites and customs, they ended up massacring for the pleasure the Latins who resided at Constantinople; in 1182; the head of a cardinal attached to the tail of a dog could be seen rebounding on the cobblestones of the city! After having concealed these historical truths, the aforesaid Servant of God could address himself to the Catholic bishops in order to preach to them the spirit of openness: « *How much do we dream that the pastors of this glorious land, whether they belong to the Orthodox Church or the Catholic Church, when the difficulties of the past are surmounted and when confronting with courage and a spirit of charity the present difficulties, feel responsible together for the one Church of Christ and for her credibility in the eyes of the world.* » How can schismatic bishops – who have just been reinforced in their opposition to Rome by the “repentance” of the Pope – feel « *responsible for the one Church of Christ* » if they do not begin by entering her? One has the distinct feeling that the

aforesaid Servant of God no longer discerns the Church of which he is the Head. His heart and his thought are absorbed by his dream, his utopia, his gnosis.

Another example: the message addressed by the aforesaid Servant of God to the Roman colloquium on the Jesuit Matteo Ricci. Taking a stand in favour of him, he apologised for the « *errors* » of the past: « *I feel deep sadness for these errors and limits of the past* » that may have given « *the impression of a lack of respect and esteem for the Chinese people* ».

Is not the devotedness of thousands of missionaries and nuns exercised in conditions of heroic poverty, notably in leper-houses, sufficient for showing the love of Holy Church for the Chinese people? The aforesaid Servant of God does not speak of them. How can the author of such a lie by omission, which sullies the image of the Church in the eyes of the Chinese, be beatified?

May the tribunal deign to hear the third example. In November 2001, for the first time, a Pope personally sent an e-mail to Catholic officials of the entire world. This document, *Ecclesia in Oceania*, recapitulated the conclusions of the Roman synod of 1998 devoted to Oceania; one of its conclusions consisted in condemning sexual abuses committed by priests during the evangelisation of Oceania and Australia in the nineteenth century. In doing so, the aforesaid Servant of God gave substance to the calumnies spread by the Protestants and the freemason administrators against the missionaries in order to turn the natives away from them, instead of exalting their incomparable civilising work.

The sad example of Papua New Guinea, sinking since then into anarchy, immorality and violence, to the point of only finding safety in a disguised return to Australian colonisation, is the fruit of this non-recognition of the salutary action of the one, holy Catholic and apostolic Church, by the aforesaid Servant of God.

It is noteworthy that everywhere the aforesaid Servant of God was able to apply his doctrine, there followed a decline of the Church and, in the same stroke, evil in all its forms was back with a vengeance. It suffices to take the example of Northwest Canada where, for close to a century, the missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate devoted themselves in the hardest missions in the world. Ecumenical dialogue, claims for the rights of Man, “repentance” had devastating effects there: the diocese and missions are on the verge of bankruptcy under the blow of court sentences for sexual abuse and, as there was not enough of that to ruin them, for... cultural abuse. The judges heard all too well the aforesaid Servant of God declare, during his trip to Canada in 1984, that the Church did not respect the culture of the autochthon! Today, while the missions close down, the native youth sink into all the vices, when they do not return to shamanistic practices!

The conclusion is evident: not only did the aforesaid Servant of God not practice the heroism of charity, but he was guilty of an *inversion* of apostolic zeal.

CONCLUSION :

OUR LADY OF FATIMA DESPISED

If the aforesaid Servant of God seriously failed in Faith, Hope and Charity, the case is settled. It seems opportune, however, to bring before the tribunal the verification of our demonstration by a proof that does not come from theology, but from simple observation. The aforesaid Servant of God, whose motto "*Totus Tuus*" proclaims Marian devotion, always had contempt for the apparitions of Our Lady of Fatima and their very precise demands.

No one, however, can doubt their authenticity, neither those of 1917 nor those that completed them at Pontevedra in 1925 and at Tuy in 1929. They constitute the most important Marian epiphany of the entire history of the Church. Nevertheless, according to his own admission, it took the assassination attempt on the aforesaid Servant of God on 13 May 1981, the anniversary of the day of the first apparition, for him to take an interest in them. It is true that afterwards he went on pilgrimage to Fatima, that he beatified the two seers, Francisco and Jacinta, who died in 1919 and 1920, that he raised to the rank of sanctuary the place of the apparitions of Pontevedra. How then can we speak of contempt?

It is nevertheless an established fact that Sister Lucy, the last of the seers of Fatima, who returned to God a few weeks before the aforesaid Servant of God, was not treated any better during her lifetime than... the Abbé de Nantes! He was often blamed for the "offensive tone" of his admonitions; the tribunal will observe that the numerous marks of veneration and affection for the Common Father given by Sister Lucy did not obtain any more attention or benevolence for her.

How can this be surprising since the message of the Mother of God, faithfully transmitted by the seer, was irreconcilable with the personal thoughts of the aforesaid Servant of God? Indeed, after the vision of Hell, the Blessed Virgin revealed the means for turning souls away from it: « **God wishes to establish in the world devotion to My Immaculate Heart.** » The salvation of souls and world peace depends on the obedience of the Church to this divine will. Therefore all is in the hands of the Holy Father: it is up to him to consecrate Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, after having ordered the bishops to do it with him, in order for her to be converted; it is up to him also to recommend the devotion of the five First Saturdays of the month. By means of these simple demands, it is the necessity for conversion to the Catholic Church, the mediation of the Virgin Mary, the universal authority of the Vicar of Christ the King, the existence of Heaven and Hell that are recalled to the world, all of which are explicit truths that clash head-on-with the « Wojtylian gnosis »!

This is why, when the aforesaid Servant of God recommended the recitation of the Rosary, on 28 October 1981, he was careful not to mention explicitly the specific demand that Our Lady of Fatima made at each of Her apparitions of 1917, for *daily* recitation of the Rosary.

During his pilgrimage at the site of the apparitions on 12 May 1982, not only did he not reveal the so long-awaited secret, but he spoke of it in an offhand way:

« *Do you want me to tell you a secret ...? It is quite simple and it is no longer a secret: "Pray much, say the rosary every day."* »

The only thing that had never been a secret!

In his preaching during this pilgrimage, not only did the aforesaid Servant of God not give approval to the reparatory devotion but he turned the faithful away from it:

« *In the jubilant expectation of giving concrete expression to all that, fully, at holy Mass tomorrow, let us live our pilgrimage to the full, here and now, in Eucharist, by offering ourselves to God through the Immaculate Heart of Mary, in thanksgiving and receptivity let us offer our sacrifices in union with Christ the Redeemer and let us repeat in an expiatory and propitiatory prayer of our souls: "Lord Jesus, it is for love of Thee, in reparation for sins, and for the conversion of sinners."* » Now, the exact formula of the prayer taught by the Blessed Virgin is: « **O Jesus, it is for love of Thee, in reparation for the sins committed against the Immaculate Heart of Mary and for the conversion of poor sinners.** » Moreover, the aforesaid Servant of God substituted for the consecration to Mary or to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, the offering *to God through Mary*.

The aforesaid Servant of God also quoted the prayer of the Angel: « **My God, I believe, I adore, I hope and I love Thee** », but he passed over in silence the second part of this prayer: « **I beg pardon for those who do not believe, who do not adore, who do not hope, who do not love Thee.** » Why?

On the morning of this 13 May at 1982, he met Sister Lucy in private. During the meeting, which lasted from twenty to twenty-five minutes, the messenger of Heaven handed him an important letter in which she confirmed that the visions of the Third Secret are closely connected with the words of the Blessed Virgin that preceded them: they describe, in an allegorical manner, the divine promises and, above all, the chastisements connected with the refusal of the high authorities of the Church to satisfy the demands of Heaven.

« *The third part of the Secret, that you are anxious to understand she wrote to the Pope, is a symbolic revelation referring to this part of the Message, and is conditioned by our response or non-response to what the Message itself asks of us: "If My requests are heeded, Russia will be converted, and there will be peace; if not, she will spread her errors throughout the world, etc."* Since we did not heed this appeal of the Message, we see that it has been fulfilled and that Russia has invaded the world with her errors. If we have not yet seen the complete fulfilment of the final part of this prophecy, we are marching towards it with great strides. »

During this conversation with Sister Lucy, the aforesaid Servant of God tried to convince her that it was « *not necessary or prudent to reveal the content of the third Secret, since the world would not understand it* ». He evaded the question of the consecration of Russia by saying that he would speak of « *all these things* » to the bishops at the synod of 1983.

In his homily, however, during the Mass that followed, the aforesaid Servant of God let it be falsely understood that his predecessors had already responded to the demands of « *the Lady of the message* »: « *Pius XII wanted to consecrate to the Immaculate Heart of Mary the entire human race and especially the populations of Russia. Did he not, through this consecration, satisfy the evangelical resonance of the call of Fatima?* »

For his part, the aforesaid Servant of God only claimed to want to « *accomplish once again what my predecessors have already done: entrust the world to the heart of the Mother* ».

After the ceremony, he insinuated that he had satisfied the requests of Heaven. At the sacristy of the sanctuary, when a bishop congratulated him for having consecrated the world, he replied with a smile: « *And Russia also.* » Moreover, the day after his trip to Portugal, during the audience of 19 May, in evoking the “consecration” of 13 May, he stated: « *I have tried to do all that I could in the concrete circumstances to bring out the collegial unity of the Bishop of Rome with all his brothers in the ministry and in the episcopal service of the world.* »

The Abbé de Nantes could legitimately conclude in an editorial of the Catholic Counter-Reformation, entitled “*The Supreme Deception*”, that the aforesaid Servant of God acted as if he had obeyed Our Lady:

« **The worst of it is that he wanted to make the good think that he was doing all that was necessary, all that was humanly possible, and all that supernatural prudence inspired him to do, whilst he showed the bad that he was not taken in by the fatimist legends, stories and hysteria, that he required no one to believe in them and asked no effort from anyone.** »

As for Sister Lucy, she pointed out that, in keeping with the words of Our Lord, during the revelation of Rianjo, in 1931, His ministers did not want to listen to His demand; they were delaying its execution. The day after her meeting with the aforesaid Servant of God, she met with Mgr Hnilica, Fr. Sebastian Labo, Don Luigi Bianchi, and the Provincial of the Carmelites in the parlour of the Carmel of Fatima:

« **Sister, asked Don Luigi Bianchi, in his act of offering yesterday, did the Pope really consecrate Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary?** » With her index finger, Sister Lucy made a gesture of denial. Then with both hands, she indicated the shape of the globe explaining that, for the request of Our Lady to be fulfilled, it is necessary for each bishop in his own cathedral to make a public and solemn act of consecration. She remarked that Russia had not been the

object of the consecration. God, however, wanted « *the consecration of Russia and uniquely of Russia, without any addition* »; she insisted, for « *Russia is an immense, well defined territory, and its conversion will attract attention, and thus manifest what can be obtained through consecration to the Immaculate Heart of Mary* ».

Although Sister Lucy once again bore witness to the desires of Heaven and Mgr Beltritti, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, recalled them to the bishops of the synod of 1983, the aforesaid Servant of God nevertheless made the decision to write on 8 December 1983 to the bishops of the entire world, to inform them of the ceremony that would take place at Rome on 25 March 1984 so that they could, on that day, « *renew* » with him the consecration: « *The words of the text that I am sending to you correspond, with some slight modifications, to those that I pronounced at Fatima on 13 May 1982.* » Assuredly, some « *slight* », too « *slight modifications* »: the only addition was the mention of the jubilee year of the Redemption.

At the Carmel of Coimbra, on Thursday, 22 March 1984, Mrs. Pestana, her old friend, asked her: « **Well then, Lucy, will the consecration be on Sunday?** » The seer motioned “no” and declared:

« *This consecration cannot have a decisive character* » since « *Russia did not appear clearly as the only object of the Consecration* » (*The Whole Truth about Fatima*, Vol. 4, p. 425)

The announced “consecration” did take place on 25 March 1984, in Rome, in the square before Saint Peter’s basilica, before the statue of Our Lady of Fatima, which had been brought intentionally from the Capelinha, The aforesaid Servant of God read his “act of offering”, adding this supplication to it: « *Illuminate especially the peoples in whose favour you are awaiting our consecration and offering.* »

That evening, when taking leave of Our Lady, he declared that he had wanted to consecrate « *all peoples, especially those in so much need of this consecration, those peoples for whom You [the Virgin Mary] Yourself await our act of consecration, the act that entrusts them to You.* ». In expressing himself thus, the Pope recognised that the Blessed Virgin Mary was still awaiting the consecration demanded. He conceded that his act of offering had not responded to the demands of Heaven.

The thoughts of the aforesaid Servant of God ran contrary to those of the Immaculate Heart of Mary. The Pope wished for the reconciliation of the “*separated Churches of the East and the West*”, but he did not want for all that « to convert » Russia to Catholicism, since his great millenarian plan was to unite all denominations, on an equal footing, without letting the Catholic Church claim any superiority over “the others”. His whole programme responded to his chimera of a peaceful world in which religions would form one single “Movement for the Spiritual Animation of Universal Democracy”, a chimera of which the meeting that he organised at Assisi on 27 October 1986 was the symbol. The

violent contradiction that exists between the desires of God, revealed at Fatima, and the interfaith enterprises for peace of the aforesaid Servant of God, his minister, was made manifest, precisely in the course of the meeting of Assisi, by a very moving event. A procession had advanced, bearing a processional litter on which stood the statue of Our Lady of Fatima, above a spray of flowers arranged in the form of a white heart bearing the wound, on a background of red flowers. The stewards, however, had turned it back and the litter with the statue had to be abandoned there, on the ground, in the grass.

« **This is the incident, the Abbé de Nantes commented, that provides food for thought: the heavenly sign in a long, cold, joyless day, without faith and without light, when God seemed deaf to the prayers that rose to Him. What were all those people concerned with in that place, on that day? Peace. They were concerned with procuring peace for the world. Through whom and by what means? Through all religions and all cults.**

« **It is then that the Person who has received from the one true God the gift of peace came forward. She approached and came to offer the assembly of all religions the gift of Her grace to all those who would pray to Her and beseech Her, and through Her touch the Heart of Her Son, without whom no man and no people can do anything. And here She was turned back! What a sign! Out of respect for the Chief Rabbi of Rome and the grand Mufti of Mecca, the snake worshipers and the fire worshipers, and the devotees of Buddha, whose golden statue was enthroned for the occasion above the empty tabernacle of the church of St. Peter!**

« **What did they do at Assisi? The aim, the supreme desire of Jesus is that men, that the Pope and all the bishops, that all should open their hearts to Mary. At Assisi the other evening, they repulsed Her and turned Her away! They preferred to pray to Buddha and to Allah for peace!**

« **Fatima teaches us that She alone can help us to obtain the peace of the world and the end of war. Yet She alone was turned away at Assisi. By a Pope whom She had – he said so himself – saved from death on 13 May 1981, five years before. What an irreparable aberration!** » (CCR no 195, December 1986, p. 9-10)

In his encyclical *Redemptoris Mater*, published on 25 March 1987 in order to prepare for a Marian Year, He only cited Fatima once, as a place of pilgrimage among others. He did not recommend the recitation of the Rosary: the word cannot even be found in the encyclical! Assuredly, he spoke of the “*Heart of Mary of Nazareth*”, but never used the expression “Immaculate Heart” that so fittingly calls to mind Her signal privilege.

Furthermore, the aforesaid Servant of God misrepre-

sented the promises of Fatima, by letting it be thought that the break-up of the Soviet Union and the end of the persecutions against the Orthodox Church had marked their fulfilment. The truth is that the conflict between the Holy See and the Patriarchate of Moscow have only worsened since the reorganisation of the Latin Catholic Church, in Russia, in Byelorussia and in Kazakhstan, decreed in 1991. The law of the Russian Federation on liberty of conscience and on religious associations that came into effect on 1 August 1997, obliges each Catholic parish to register annually, as though it were some sect, like the Jehovah Witnesses, and this registration can be arbitrarily revoked at any time.

Finally, in 1989, to have done with Fatima and the demands for the consecration of Russia that bothered him, the aforesaid Servant of God wanted Sister Lucy to stop saying that the act of offering of 25 March 1984 did not respond to the demands of Our Lady of Fatima. She was forced to maintain the contrary by an order of John Paul II that was transmitted to the seer by the intermediary of Cardinal Casaroli, Secretary of State (*The Whole Truth about Fatima*, Vol. 4, p. 452).

There is something even more serious. On May 2000, on the occasion of the beatification of the two little seers, Francisco and Jacinta, the aforesaid Servant of God made public the third part of the Secret that had been concealed since 1960, but accompanied it by an appalling piece of stage craft that deprived this revelation of its saving effect for the Church and the world. Even before its complete publication, Cardinal Sodano, the Secretary of State, gave, in the presence of the aforesaid Servant of God, an official interpretation that reduced the Secret to the announcement of the attack against the aforesaid Servant of God, arbitrarily identified with « *the bishop dressed in white* » of the vision. Six weeks later when the authentic text was unveiled, and when it became obvious that « *the bishop dressed in white* » could not be the aforesaid Servant of God, the event of the Secret already no longer interested the press agencies... The entire Church no longer gave it any attention, because it was thought that what was essential was already known. As for the explanatory document issued by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, accompanying the complete text of the Secret, its omissions and inaccuracies are such that it is difficult to think that its authors did not have their hands forced.

At the end of our demonstration, the tribunal must be struck by the gravity of the failings of the aforesaid Servant of God in Faith, Hope and Charity, and of the little importance that he attached to the demands of Heaven revealed at Fatima by the Virgin Mary. These irrefutable facts are insuperable obstacles to his beatification, but they explain the dramatic state in which he left the Church. At his death, she appeared in all truth as the « *city half in ruins* » of the vision of the Secret that was shown to the little seers on 13 July 1917.

AFTER ASSISI... NOW THE DAMAGES!

A sensational initiative. This summit of all the world's religions for universal peace opens a new era. What wouldn't one do for peace! Neither governments nor the great international organisations are capable of saving peace. It needs a spiritual thrust, inspiration and animation that only the religions can breathe into the four and a half billion men ready to tear one another to pieces. Only the religions can obtain peace, from their faith "in God and in Man."

To succeed in assembling the representatives is in itself a step in the direction of their mutual understanding, their federation and finally their reunion. Each religion sees its right to existence recognised by all the others; it sees its place in the sun, in its traditional sociological terrain, and its share in the word and the decision-making of a future universal assembly of religions, endowed with powers for the elaboration of a common Credo for the fight against marginal sects and the unconditional protection of human rights and the freedom of the peoples.



Pope John Paul II at Assisi, 27 October 1986, presides over the idolatrous meeting of the "twelve religions," in order to obtain from the gods of the pagans, who are devils (Ps. 96,) the peace that God alone gives, of which only Jesus Christ disposes, and which He wishes to cause to reign on earth only at the request and for the honour of the Immaculate Heart of Mary.

FOR JOHN-PAUL II, IT IS GOD'S PLAN

As for our Holy Father the Pope, theologian and disciple of Karl Rahner's, whose tempting thesis of "anonymous Christians" we find recurring here, what would he regard as the sincere beliefs of men of good will and of all the world's religions?

1. – God created men of one single family whom he loves as a father, making no distinction between some and others; they are all loved by Him, all are brothers and all

are equally called to salvation.

2. – The Son of God having become man, He communicates to all, in some manner, His divinity; He has already saved them in hope and has merited for them all the capacity to work their salvation there where they find themselves, using the means at their disposal, which are their various religions.

3. – Thus the revealed religions, Judaism and its offshoot Christianity, are not the enemies of the (false) relig-

ions, but rather their elders, their revealers and their guides. The Christians alone are able to realise and make others realise that they are all sons of the same God, all brothers together, all on the path of salvation, each according to his own traditional religion.

THE ASSISI GATHERING, A FIRST STAGE

On 27 October the high walls of hostility, ignorance and contempt dividing the great religions from one another fell to the ground at Assisi. Furthermore, the many prayers thus united for the good of all mankind must have singularly touched God, the Creator and Father of all men, without distinction of race, sex, religion or nationality, and Jesus their Saviour.

Such gatherings will, therefore, gradually lead to discovering a certain common ground to all religions: an emanation of the one divine Spirit, meeting indeed with John-Paul II's fundamental *CREDO*. This, however, will not prevent each religion from preserving, without fanaticism, intolerance or proselytism, its own beliefs and rites, the expressions of mankind's various age-old cultures.

Thus in fact there will be established a new universal religion, recognising one sole God the friend of men, one sole Saviour of all men, the Christ, for those who believe in Him, and one sole Spirit raising up the seeds of supernatural life in all souls and salvific initiatives through all religions from the beginning of the world. Catholicism, ready to efface itself – as at Assisi – the better to serve men, will become the revealer of the universal divine presence, experienced by all, but blindly as it were, and adored under all forms, even the most surprising.

That is the new open universal theology which inspired the interreligious gathering at Assisi.

« THE DEVIL HAS ENGAGED THE DECISIVE BATTLE, THAT IS, THE FINAL BATTLE, FROM WHICH ONE OF THE TWO WILL EMERGE EITHER THE VICTOR OR THE VANQUISHED: EITHER WE ARE WITH GOD, OR WITH THE DEVIL. » (Sister Lucy of Fatima)

« *It is my conviction; the Pope seems to be telling scandalised and alarmed Catholics, it is the only one and it is the right one* », as de Gaulle said to the French who were revolted by his decolonisation policy. Alas, it was not the only one, and it was the worst !

THE CONVICTION OF (TRUE) MISSIONARIES

Father Henry van Straelen, for example, in his unas-

sailable « **Opening to the other. Which one?** » (Beauchesne, 1982), expresses the gravest reservations and the sharpest criticisms with regard to such initiatives and the illusions with which they are inspired. He denounces them as contrary to Scripture, contrary to the Church's uninterrupted Tradition, contrary to the very essence of the missionary institution, to the experience of converts, to the expectation of the pagan peoples, in short contrary to common-sense and to the Catholic Faith.

Why? Because Rahner and the other theologians of the West speak of what they do not know, guided by wrong-headed prejudice.

1. – No, the (false) religions offer no real opening to the Christian and Catholic Faith. Dialogue is a snare and delusion, ecumenism a ruinous and scandalous denial of Jesus Christ, with no returns paid.

2. – No, the peoples of Asia and of Africa hold neither to their dead religions nor to their traditional cultures, and they await every shape and form of their future from the West. It is for the West to provide it! It is for Catholic missionaries to preach!

3. – No, convergencies do not prevail over divergencies. The (false) religions are syntheses whose dominant note is hostile to the biblical Revelation and to the Catholic Faith, ignorant of God and without love for neighbour.

4. – The supposed religious leaders invited to such interreligious congresses do not leave any the better for it. On the contrary, they are puffed up with pride by the undeserved honour paid to them (photos alongside the Pope!), and they are all the more contemptuous of their hosts for having listened to and flattered them.

5. – No, such an alignment of the true Faith and of the true religion with all the world's false religions and beliefs is not a good thing but an absolute ruin for Catholic missions, a departure from Holy Church, from her Way, her Truth and her Life; it is an apostasy.

It all adds up to a nullity, therefore. Worse than a nullity, an evil, a thing of Hell. The Pope would have done better to summon all the world's bishops to Fatima, there to satisfy the requests of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary and obtain from her all powerful intercession « *a time of peace for the world* ».

Brother Bruno of Jesus.