

## CHAPTER IV

# Doctrinal Novelties of the Post-Conciliar Church

**T**his chapter examines two of the primary doctrinal novelties of Vatican II — religious liberty and ecumenism — in light of the perpetual and infallible teaching of the Catholic Church. This chapter demonstrates how those doctrinal novelties of Vatican II are actually contrary to what the Church has always taught and that those concepts have been repeatedly condemned by the previous popes down through the ages.

### Religious Liberty

The Council does not limit itself to proclaiming a right to religious tolerance but positively sets forth the “right to religious liberty”.<sup>142</sup> It has been maintained by some authors that *Dignitatis Humanae* defines the right to religious liberty strictly as the negative right not to be coerced,<sup>143</sup> as opposed to the positive right to practice the religion of one’s choice according to one’s conscience. An astute examination of the text and context of key passages of *Dignitatis Humanae* clearly shows that this is not the case.

In the report read by Bishop De Smedt during the second session of the Council, Father Wiltgen explained “Bishop De Smedt described religious freedom positively as ‘the right of a human person to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of his own conscience.’ Negatively, it could be described as ‘immunity from all external force in those personal relationships with God which are proper to the conscience of man’.”<sup>144</sup> The cited conciliar passage is not a definition in the strict sense, but merely sets forth the negative description. A more positive formulation of the right to religious liberty is found further on in no. 4: “*Tandem in sociali*

*hominis natura atque in ipsa indole religionis fundatur ius quo homines, suo ipsorum sensu religioso moti, libere possunt conventus habere ...*”\* Here a positive right to religious liberty has clearly been set forth, since the positive rights set forth in this clause hinge directly and necessarily on the right to freely practice the religion of one’s conscience, and therefore it is a logical impossibility to entirely reduce the Council’s *ius ad libertatem religiosam* to a mere *immunitas a coërcitione* as the Council attempts to do with the deceptive formula *Libertas seu immunitas a coërcitione in re religiosa*.\*\*

That the Council is not merely upholding the right to profess the true Faith and practice the Catholic religion is clearly manifested in the proposition: “nor is anyone to be restrained from acting *in accordance with his convictions* in religious matters in private or in public, alone or in associations with others.”<sup>145</sup> The phrases, “*in accordance with his convictions*” and “*in public ... or in associations with others*” qualify the Council’s teaching in such a manner as to unmistakably identify the religious liberty of *Dignitatis Humanæ* with the “Liberty of Conscience and forms of worship” formally condemned by Pius IX.

*Dignitatis Humanæ* further specifies that the so-called ‘right’ to religious freedom “is the right of religious groups not to be prevented from freely demonstrating the special value of their teaching,”<sup>146</sup> and that “Religious communities have the further right *not to be prevented from publicly teaching and bearing witness to their beliefs by the spoken or written word.*”<sup>147</sup> Since the Council teaches that, “This right of the human person to religious freedom *must be given such recognition in the constitutional order of society as will make it a civil right*”, the “civil authority ... *if it presumes to control or restrict religious activity, it must be said to have ex-*

---

\* “Finally, rooted in the social nature of man and in the very nature of religion is the right of men, prompted by their own religious sense, freely to hold meetings...” —*Dignitatis Humanæ* [4]. **Documents of Vatican II**, Austin P. Flannery, O.P.

\*\* “right to religious liberty”, “immunity from coercion”, “liberty or immunity from coercion in religious matters” — *Dignitatis Humanæ* [4], **Documents of Vatican II**, Austin P. Flannery, O. P.

*ceeded the limits of its power.*"<sup>148</sup> The Council yet specifies further that if "special civil recognition is given to one religious community in the constitutional organisation of the State, *the right of all citizens and religious communities to religious freedom must be recognised and respected as well.*"<sup>149</sup> Thus, the Council clearly and unequivocally professes the condemned error that the 'right' to "Liberty of Conscience and forms of worship ... must be proclaimed and guaranteed in every correctly established society."

The Council proclaims the total liberty of conscience in religious matters when it blasphemously teaches: "It is therefore *fully in accordance with the nature of faith* that in religious matters, *every form of coercion by men should be excluded.*"<sup>150</sup> This proposition is clearly heretical — indeed, if this proposition were to be accepted according to the proper signification of its terms, then not even the Pope would possess the power to lawfully compel anyone to obey him through the coercive power of the Holy Inquisition or by the assistance of the secular arm. The Council proclaims, "in religious matters the human person should be kept free from all manner of coercion in civil society."<sup>151</sup> In conformity with the perpetual tradition and teaching of the Church, Pope Pius IX teaches that the civil liberty of all these cults "propagates the pestilence of Indifferentism."<sup>152</sup>

It is beyond legitimate theological dispute that a person who has never been a Catholic may not be compelled to embrace the Catholic Faith. However, "religious liberty in society," which is in fact the "liberty of conscience and forms of worship" already condemned by the Church, is in fact nothing else than a licence to practice false religions and is in no manner to be likened to the "liberty of the act of Christian faith".<sup>153</sup>

Father Dörmann observes:

The faith required in the Gospel is and remains a free, personal act of each man. He can refuse it. It is up to each man whether he converts or not. The preaching of Jesus and the apostles is addressed to man's freedom to choose. It is thus primarily a question of man's free will, which is

required for any human act of the moral or religious order. Hence, in his attitude towards God, and Christ, man has the possibility to accept or refuse the Gospel, even God Himself and His commandments. Hence, for the free act of conversion, this freedom is essential, which the Gospel leaves intact. But does man also have the *moral right* to refuse God's will, especially since he has the obligation to follow God's commandments? The first three commandments are also included in the Decalogue. As man has the freedom, but not the right, to steal, to murder, to lie or to commit adultery, so also he has the freedom, but not the right, to do away with the commandments which concern his duties to God. If he had such a right, there would be no such thing as judgement day. Such a right is not "part" of divine revelation. Thus it cannot be founded on that revelation.<sup>154</sup>

Now let us consider the unequivocal and forceful condemnation of this most abominable error of religious liberty pronounced by the popes. Pope Gregory XVI in *Mirari vos* condemned liberty of conscience:

From this poisoned source of Indifferentism is derived that false and absurd maxim or rather that delirium, that liberty of conscience must be procured and guaranteed for everyone. This is an error among the most contagious, to which the way is smoothed by this liberty of opinions, absolute and without restraint, which, for the ruin of the Church and the State, goes on spreading itself everywhere and which certain men, by the excess of impudence, do not fear to represent as advantageous to religion. "What death more fatal for souls than the freedom of error!" said St. Augustine.

In the *Syllabus*<sup>155</sup> of Pius IX, we read the solemn and infallible\* condemnation of the following errors:

---

\* "Itaque omnes et singulas pravias opiniones ac doctrinas singillatim hisce litteris commemoratas auctoritate Nostra Apostolica reprobamus, proscribimus atque damnamus, easque ab omnibus catholicae Ecclesiae filiis veluti reprobatas, proscriptas atque damnatas omnino haberi volumus et mandamus." (D.S. 2896)

(Footnote continued on next page.)

77. In our time, it is no longer useful that the Catholic religion be considered as the only religion of the State, to *the exclusion of all the other cults*.

78. Therefore, it is with reason that, in some Catholic countries, the law has provided that the foreigners who go there enjoy the public exercise of their particular forms of worship there.

79. It is false that the civil liberty of all the cults and the full power left to all to manifest openly and publicly all their thoughts and all their opinions, throws the peoples more easily into corruption of morals and of the mind, and propagates the pestilence of Indifferentism.

Archbishop Lefebvre points out that “What is common to all these pontifical condemnations is religious liberty, designated under the name of ‘*freedom of conscience*,’ or ‘*liberty of conscience and forms of worship*,’ namely: **the right conceded to every man publicly to exercise the cult of the religion of his choice, without being disturbed by the civil power.**”<sup>156</sup>

The human person does not possess the moral right to transgress the commandments of God, since, in issuing the commandments, God establishes a moral obligation for the human race to observe them. The first commandment sets forth the obligation to worship God according to the Catholic faith and religion,<sup>157</sup> and therefore the refusal to observe this commandment constitutes the sin of *infidelity*.<sup>158</sup> A ‘right’ to religious liberty, therefore, does not pertain to the Deposit of Faith and is not founded on divine revelation, but is contrary to the Faith and is heretical.<sup>159</sup> “*He who believes and is baptised shall be saved, but he who does not believe shall be condemned.*” – St. Mark, 16:16.

---

“Therefore do We, by our Apostolic authority, reprobate, denounce, and condemn each and every evil opinion and doctrine individually mentioned in this Letter, and We will and command that they be held as reprobated, denounced, and condemned by all the children of the Catholic Church.”

The solemn and definitive character of this pronouncement qualifies the theological note of the *Syllabus* as infallible. (Can. 750 §2 as revised by Pope John Paul II)

## Ecumenism

Another striking example of doctrinal error in the Second Vatican Council is to be found in *Unitatis Redintegratio*, where we read: “It follows that the separated Churches and communities *as such*, ... have been by no means deprived of significance and importance *in the mystery of salvation*. For the Spirit of Christ *has not refrained from using them as means of salvation* which derive their efficacy from the very fullness of grace and truth entrusted to the Catholic Church.”<sup>160</sup>

About this text I already commented above. Archbishop Lefebvre has unequivocally denounced the heretical tenet of Ecumenism which holds that the Catholic Church is better than the others, but the others also are ‘means of salvation’<sup>161</sup>: “If this is the case,” says Mons. Lefebvre, “then the Church is merely useful; she is no longer indispensable. She is only one of the means of salvation.”<sup>162</sup>

The Archbishop elaborates further:

We must say it clearly: such a concept is radically opposed to Catholic dogma. The Church is the one ark of salvation, and we must not be afraid to affirm it. You have often heard it said, “Outside the Church there is no salvation” — a dictum which offends contemporary minds. It is easy to believe that this doctrine is no longer in effect, that it has been dropped. It seems excessively severe.

Yet nothing, in fact, has changed; nothing can be changed in this area. Our Lord did not found a number of Churches: He founded only One. There is only one Cross by which we can be saved, and that Cross has been given to the Catholic Church. To His Church, His mystical bride, Christ has given all graces. No grace in the world, no grace in the history of humanity is distributed except through her.

Archbishop Lefebvre is, of course, entirely correct in professing the doctrine that “Outside the Church there is no salvation”. In the Profession of Faith it is set forth: “By the heart we believe and by the mouth we confess the one Church, not of heretics but the Holy Ro-

man, Catholic, and Apostolic (Church) outside of which we believe that no one is saved.”<sup>163</sup> There can be no salvation in a Protestant, fundamentalist or any other sect because the supernatural means of salvation, the word of God and the Sacraments which constitute our Sacred Tradition, have not been given to them but have been exclusively bestowed upon the Catholic Church by Christ. Justification is by faith: not by mere human works or by mere human faith but by divine and Catholic Faith — that justification which transforms us from children of wrath into children of God is brought about *ex opere operato* by the power of the sacrament of Baptism and by the Theological Virtue of Faith given to us, along with the indelible character conferred upon our souls that sets us apart and marks us heirs of the Kingdom of God and co-heirs with Jesus Christ Our Divine Lord and Saviour. There is only “One Lord, One Faith and One Baptism” (Eph. 4:5) — the One Lord is Jesus Christ, the one Faith is the one “divine deposit” (Vat. I), which constitutes “actual original tradition, teaching and faith of the Catholic Church, which the Lord bestowed, the apostles proclaimed and the Fathers safeguarded”;<sup>164</sup> and the one Baptism is the divinely instituted sacrament by which we gain entry into the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. At our Baptism we were asked “*Quid petis ab Ecclesia Dei?*” (What do you ask from the Church of God?), and the answer we gave was: “*Fidem*” (Faith). There is no salvation outside the Church because there is no Divine and Catholic Faith anywhere except within the bosom of the Catholic Church.

Baptism is a divinely instituted sacrament, instituted by Jesus Christ, by which we gain entry into His Church, the Catholic Church, and no other. The sacraments are the means of salvation which Christ has bestowed upon His Church, but they are of absolutely no use whatever for anyone who is outside of the Catholic Church.<sup>165</sup>

We receive the Faith from the Catholic Church, because the Catholic Church is the sole repository of the “divine Deposit” which it received from Christ. The word of God preached by the Church is the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and there is no other Gospel of salvation other

than that which is found in the Catholic Church. Even if an angel from Heaven should preach another gospel than that which we have received from the Church, he is to be condemned, says Saint Paul (Gal. 1:8-9). “Whoever would be saved,” says the Athanasian Creed, “before all else it is necessary that he hold to the Catholic Faith; unless such a one preserves it integral and inviolate, without doubt he will perish in eternity.”<sup>166</sup> God Himself, the primary Truth, is the object of Faith — that is why it is called a *Theological Virtue*, since, as St. Thomas explains, “it is faith that first unites us to God.” That faith which unites us to God is the Catholic Faith, the “one faith” (Eph. 4:5), “which gives us eternal life”.<sup>167</sup> We do not share that faith with any heretical church, sect or ecclesial community; nor can anyone be saved by the mere human *gnosis* — the profession of mere human faith which constitutes the creed of an heretical denomination.

The Church, therefore, exhorts all who would embrace that faith which justifies unto eternal life, to renounce whatever perfidious superstitions, errors or infidelity that previously defiled their souls:

- *Horresce idola, respue simulacra.*
- *Horresce Judaicum perfidiam, respue Hebraicam superstitionem.*
- *Horresce Mahumeticam perfidiam, respue pravam sectam infidelitatis.*
- *Horresce hæreticam pravitatem, respue nefarias sectas impiorum.* [N.]<sup>168</sup>

When the Council, therefore, proclaims that the separate churches *as such* have some importance in the work of salvation, and that the “Spirit of Christ *has not refrained from using them as means of salvation,*” it blasphemes the Spirit of Christ and professes heresy. The same blasphemous outrage is to be found in the new Catechism which states in n. 819: “Christ’s Spirit uses these Churches and ecclesial communities as means of salvation”.<sup>169</sup> *Lumen Gentium* accommodates this heresy by setting forth its dubious formula that the Church of Christ “*subsists* in the Catholic Church” (n.

8), thereby making it appear possible for the Church to subsist outside the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church alone has been constituted by her divine Founder as the “universal sacrament of salvation”<sup>170</sup>; the Faith and Sacraments which constitute the Sacred Tradition of the Catholic Church are the divinely instituted *supernatural* means of salvation, and therefore the only means of salvation. Every other church is a human institution just as every other gospel is a human doctrine assented to by an act of human faith, and therefore one falls into the heresy of Pelagianism by professing such human institutions to be ‘means of salvation’.

The heresy of Ecumenism is a consequence of the liberty of conscience proclaimed in *Dignitatis Humanae*. The principle set forth in the first paragraph of that document, and which forms the basis for the doctrine of religious freedom, stinks of Masonry: “men should exercise fully their own judgement and a responsible freedom in their actions and should not be subject to the pressure of coercion but be inspired by a sense of duty.” It is from the doctrine of the autonomy of the human conscience so plainly set forth in this classic formulation of Masonic dogma that the abominable errors of separation of Church and State, Indifferentism of the State, and constitutionally protected freedom for all religions flow.<sup>171</sup> This is a clear example of the ‘principles of 1789’ entering into the Church in the documents of Vatican II. Vatican II is truly, as Cardinal Suenens said, “The French Revolution in the Church.”<sup>172</sup> “The Council,” explains Archbishop Lefebvre, “was nothing other than an attempt to assimilate to the Church the principles of Liberalism, an attempt to unite the Church to Liberal principles ... they wished to bring into the Church a conception of religious liberty different from that of Tradition, and corresponding rather with the Liberal principles of the Revolution.”<sup>173</sup> Vatican II, therefore, is not the Catholic Faith — it is contrary to the Catholic Faith.

Ecumenism has been formally condemned by the Roman Pontiff, Pope Pius XI, yet it has been vigorously promoted by Vatican II and by Pope John Paul II. In *Ut Unum Sint*, John Paul II says, “At the Second Vatican Council, the Catholic Church committed herself ir-

*revocably* to following the path of the ecumenical venture ...” (n. 3), yet John Paul II admits that “The Ecumenical movement really began within the Churches and Ecclesial Communities of the Reform.”<sup>174</sup> What John Paul II neglects to mention is that the Ecumenical movement was condemned by Pope Pius XI on January 6, 1928, in his Encyclical Letter *Mortalium Animos*, on “Fostering True Religious Unity”.

Pope John Paul II cites the teaching of the Council: “The Council states that the Church of Christ ‘subsists in the Catholic Church, which is governed by the Successors of Peter and by the Bishops in communion with him’, and at the same time acknowledges that ‘many elements of sanctification and of truth can be found outside her visible structure. These elements, however, as gifts properly belonging to the Church of Christ, possess an inner dynamism toward Catholic unity’.” With the exception of the above-mentioned dubious formula (i.e. ‘subsists in the Catholic Church’), there is really not anything objectionable in this formulation. Even St. Augustine went so far as to say, “in the Catholic Church there is also something uncatholic ... (and) there can also exist that which is Catholic outside of the Catholic Church.”<sup>175</sup>

John Paul II, however, then cites the above-mentioned heretical *non sequitur* of the Decree on Ecumenism, “It follows that these separated Churches and Communities, though we believe that they suffer from defects, have by no means been deprived of significance and value in the mystery of salvation. For the Spirit of Christ has not refrained from using them as means of salvation which derive their efficacy from the very fullness of grace and truth entrusted to the Catholic Church.” (n. 10) John Paul continues on doctrinally unorthodox ground stating, “To the extent that these elements are found in other Christian Communities, *the one Church of Christ is effectively present in them.*” (n. 11) The above-cited decree of the Council of Florence categorically excludes such a notion from the Catholic Faith professing: “the unity of the ecclesiastical body is so strong that only to those remaining within it are the sacraments of the Church of benefit for salvation ... and that no one, whatever

almsgiving he has practiced, even if he shed his blood for the name of Christ, can be saved, unless he has remained in the bosom and unity of the Catholic Church.”

In the name of Ecumenism, Pope John Paul II upholds the heretical opinion that in spite of the “doctrinal disagreements” between the Catholic Church and the Christian Sects, “the *communion of faith which already exists between Christians* provides a solid foundation for their joint action not only in the social field but also in the religious sphere.” (n. 75) Notwithstanding that Pope St. Pius X labels the adherents of the Protestant sects as “heretics” in his Catechism,<sup>176</sup> John Paul II nevertheless states that they take part “in this movement which is called ecumenical ... not merely as individuals but also as members of the corporate groups *in which they have heard the Gospel ...*” (n. 7). John Paul II is telling us that the Lutheran, Calvinist or whatever heresy that these sectaries have heard in their so-called churches is *the Gospel*. The heresy of this proposition is so clearly evident as to need no further comment. Let it suffice to say that the ‘gospel’ of *scriptura sola* and ‘private judgement’ is not the Gospel of Christ but the heretical denial of the Catholic Faith. Such infernal doctrines invented by the depraved minds of the Reformers cannot sanctify and lead souls to Heaven, but on the contrary give occasion to every imaginable vice and bring souls to their eternal ruin. Yet Pope John Paul II does not blush when he asserts this most execrable heresy that the “*Saints come from all the Churches and Ecclesial Communities which gave them entrance into the communion of salvation.*” (n. 84)<sup>177</sup> John Paul II dares to say that these damnable sects which are nothing but covens of corruption and cesspools of error have given the *Saints* “entrance into the communion of salvation.”<sup>178</sup>

We do not share a “communion of faith” with the heretics, nor do we “share the Faith handed down from the Apostles” (n. 62) with the Orthodox.<sup>179</sup> Pope Pius XI explains in *Mortalium Animos* that we are of one faith with the *ancestors* of these “who are now entangled in the errors of Photius and of the Reformers”. In that same Encyclical Pius XI explains, “The supernatural virtue of faith has as its for-

mal motive the authority of God revealing ...” This is the traditional teaching of the Church, set forth by St. Thomas: “the formal object of faith is the first truth in so far as it is manifested in the sacred scriptures and the doctrine of the Church. *Therefore, whoever does not adhere to the teaching of the Church as an infallible and divine rule, which proceeds from the first truth in so far as it is revealed in the sacred scriptures, does not have the habit of faith ...*”<sup>180</sup>

John Paul II professes the scandalous error that the love between those who are not in perfect communion with one another “*finds its most complete expression in common prayer.*” (n. 21) “The Second Vatican Council defines their prayer,” the Pope explains, “*as the soul of the whole ecumenical movement.*” (n. 21) The Catechism published by order of John Paul II says in n. 821 that one of the things required in order to respond adequately to the ecumenical call to unity is “*prayer in common, because ‘change of heart and holiness of life, along with public and private prayer for the unity of Christians, should be regarded as the soul of the whole ecumenical movement, and merits the name spiritual ecumenism’; (Unitatis Redintegratio 8 §1.)*” Pope Pius XI echoes what the Church has always taught and condemns such practices of Ecumenism in *Mortalium Animos* explaining:

These pan-Christians who strive for the union of the churches would appear to pursue the noblest of ideals in promoting charity among all Christians. But how should charity tend to the detriment of faith? Everyone knows that **John himself, Apostle of love**, who seems in his Gospel to have revealed the secrets of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and who never ceased to impress upon the memory of his disciples the new commandment “*to love one another,*” nevertheless **strictly forbade any close social contact with those who professed a mutilated and corrupt form of Christ’s teaching: “If any man come to you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house, nor say to him, God speed you.”** (II John 10)

Contrary to the perpetual tradition of the Church, *Unitatis*

*Redintegratio* teaches that ‘worship in common’ (*communicatio in sacris*<sup>181</sup>) is sometimes to be permitted, when “Grace to be obtained ... commends it.” (n. 8) Our ‘separated brethren’ however, the heretics and schismatics, are spiritual lepers, who, as St. Augustine teaches, “are to be avoided” by Catholics and dealt with only from a distance.<sup>182</sup> “He who is within the sanctuary,” says St. Ignatius of Antioch, “is pure. But he who is outside the sanctuary is unclean ... (and) not pure in conscience.”<sup>183</sup> Such a one who is ‘not in the sanctuary’ is “someone who follows a maker of schism,” or “one who walks in an alien doctrine” — and “does not communicate with the Passion” of Christ and “shall not inherit the Kingdom of Heaven”.<sup>184</sup> “Whoever separates himself from the Church,” St. Cyprian explains, “joins himself to an adulteress, and is separated from the promises of the Church ... he is a stranger, one who is profane, an enemy”. Therefore the Church cannot worship or pray in common with such as these because “The Bride of Christ cannot commit adultery, she is pure and uncorrupted. She knows one dwelling, and she chastely guards the sanctity of the one nuptial chamber.”<sup>185</sup>

The ecumenical dialogue, recommended by *Unitatis Redintegratio*, *Ut Unum Sint* and the new Catechism, which is to take place “where each can treat with the other on an equal footing” (*UR* n. 9) has been condemned as an error in *Mortalium Animos*:

For the rest, while you may hear many non-Catholics loudly preaching brotherly communion in Jesus Christ, yet not one will you find to whom it ever occurs with devout submission to obey the Vicar of Christ in his capacity of teacher or ruler. Meanwhile, they assert their readiness to treat with the Church of Rome, *but on equal terms, as an equal with an equal*. But even if they could so treat, there seems little doubt that they would do so only on condition that no pact into which they might enter should compel them to retract those opinions which still keep them outside the one fold of Christ.

This being so, *it is clear that the Apostolic See can by no*

*means take part in these assemblies, nor is it in any way lawful for Catholics to give such enterprises their encouragement or support.* If they did so, they would be giving countenance to a false Christianity quite alien to the one Church of Christ ... For it is indeed a question of defending revealed truth. *Jesus Christ sent His Apostles into the whole world to declare the Faith of the Gospel to every nation, and to save them from error ...* The only-begotten Son of God not only bade His representatives to teach all nations; He also obliged all men to give credence to whatever was taught them by “*witnesses pre-ordained by God*” (Acts 10:41). Moreover, He enforced His command with this sanction: “*He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be condemned*” (Mark 16:16). **These two commands — the one to teach, the other to believe for salvation — must be obeyed.**

In the same document Pius XI teaches:

The energy with which this scheme is being promoted has won for it many adherents, and even many Catholics are attracted by it, since it holds out the hope of a union apparently consonant with the wishes of Holy Mother Church, whose chief desire it is to recall her erring children and bring them back to her bosom. In reality, however, *these fair and alluring words cloak a most grave error, subversive to the foundations of the Catholic Faith. ...*

*There is but one way in which the unity of Christians may be fostered, and that is by furthering the return to the one true Church of Christ of those who are separated from it; for far from that one true Church they have in the past fallen away ... If, as they constantly say, they long to be united with Us and Ours, why do they not hasten to enter the Church, “the mother and mistress of all Christ’s faithful”?* (Conc. Lateran. IV, C. 5). ...

Let our separated children, therefore, draw nigh to the Apostolic See, set up in the city which Peter and Paul, Princes of the Apostles, consecrated by their blood; ... and

let them come, not with any intention nor hope that “*the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth*” (1 Tim. 3:15), will cast aside the integrity of the Faith and tolerate their errors, but to submit themselves to its teaching and government.

The depraved novelties of Vatican II, such as those briefly dealt with above, are errors repeatedly condemned by previous popes and universally shunned by the faithful down through the ages. This consideration alone should be enough to expose the heretical character of these novelties. St. Athanasius demonstrated the heresy of the Arians by pointing out that the traditional Catholic doctrine had been “handed down from Father to Father” (ἐκ πατέρων εἰς πατέρας διαβεβηκέναι),<sup>186</sup> whereas the doctrinal novelty of the Arians was without precedent in the Church. The doctrinal novelties of Vatican II suffer the same defect. Mons. Lefebvre has demonstrated this in his above-cited work, yet Pope John Paul II condemned not the errors, but he condemned the one who sought to defend the Faith from the errors of Vatican II, by attributing to Archbishop Lefebvre “an incomplete and contradictory notion of Tradition.”<sup>187</sup> The Church can never change its doctrine, so it is entirely useless and utterly futile for anyone to appeal to the undefined and doctrinally suspect concept of a ‘*living* character of Tradition’ in order to justify the heretical novelties of Vatican II.

### **The Error of “Living Tradition”**

Sacred Tradition is of its very nature unchangeable.<sup>188</sup> “Nothing new,” says Pope Pius XI, “is ever added to the number of those truths which are at least implicitly contained within the deposit of revelation divinely committed to the Church”.<sup>189</sup> Fr. Marin-Sola explains:

... growth or evolution in doctrines can ... happen two ways: 1) growth or evolution of formulae, the meaning of which remains the same; 2) growth or evolution of formulae, the meaning of which does not remain the same.

In the first case the evolution is homogeneous; in the

second, transformistic.

Hence, the preservation or the non-preservation of the same meaning is that which distinguishes homogeneous evolution from transformistic evolution in doctrines.

Whence the traditional formula describing the homogeneous evolution of Catholic dogma enunciated by St. Vincent de Lérins, and consecrated by the Council of the Vatican [I]: “*Crescant igitur ... sed in eodem sensu*”.\*

The meaning of a doctrine remains the same throughout different formulations when the meaning of the subsequent formulae does not originate from without, but is already *implicitly contained* in the earlier formulae. Otherwise the meaning does not remain the same. This occurs in those cases where the meaning of the subsequent formulae is not implicitly contained in, but is either *contrary* to, or at least *different* from, the meaning of the earlier formulae. ...

Concepts are said to be *explicative* when they issue one from the other upon the one and only condition that our mind penetrates their *whole* content.<sup>190</sup>

A legitimate growth in the understanding of dogma is, therefore, explicative, and hence, St. Thomas refers to it as ‘*explicatio fidei*’. The Church, St. Thomas explains, “is united by faith in the profession of faith contained in the creed, professed by the person of the entire Church” (II<sup>a</sup> II<sup>ae</sup>, 1.9, ad 3<sup>m</sup>). The same truths of faith are contained in the various creeds and formulae, which differ only in so far as one explains more fully that which is contained implicitly in another. Faith, for example, in the incarnation of the divine Word, strictly implies the union of the human and divine natures in the one *hypostasis* of the Word made flesh. (cf. II<sup>a</sup> II<sup>ae</sup>, 1.7, 1.9).

---

\* Therefore ... let the understanding, the knowledge, and wisdom of individuals as of all, of one man as of the whole Church, grow and progress strongly with the passage of the ages and the centuries; but let it be solely in its own genus, namely in the same dogma, with the same sense and the same understanding (St. Vincent of Lérins). (See also Footnote 110 on p. 100.)