

**John XXIII  
‘Beatified’**

**Too?**

**Open Letter to the Episcopate**

**By Father Doctor Luigi Villa**

# **John XXIII “Beatified”**

## **Too?**

### **Open Letter to the Episcopate**

by father dr. Luigi Villa □ □ □

(First Edition: June 2000 – in Italian) □ □ □

**EDITRICE CIVILTÀ**

**Via Galileo Galilei, 121**

**25123 BRESCIA (ITALY)**

**Tel. and Fax: 001 39 030.3700003**

# INTRODUCTION

Most Reverend Excellency:

I am beginning this script on Pope John XXIII with the question cardinal Oddi asked himself, in 1988, in *Trenta Giorni* Magazine: **“Was the ‘Papa Buono’ also a good Pope?”**

I make no secret, therefore, of my disappointment when, on December 20, 1999, John Paul II issued the Decree in which he officially recognized John XXIII’s **“heroic virtues”** (?), such as he listed: **he promoted ecumenism; he inaugurated a new approach toward the Jewish world; he created the Secretariat for the Unity of the Christians;** etc. These are **virtues** of a new breed, since in the past one spoke, rather, of **Faith, of Hope, of Charity,** etc. Now, this new inventory of **virtues** could but rouse in me some perplexities, some doubts, some suspicions.

Hence those who studied the *curriculum vitae* of **John XXIII**, had the duty to analyze the not few **sophisms** that were present in his inaugural address of Vatican II, which he pronounced on October 11, 1962; namely, the **opening to the freemasons, to the protestants, to the Jews, to the communists;** openings that so weakened the Church! Instead, his euphoric optimism caused him to say that those that brought on the opening of the Council were happy circumstances: **“The conditions of modern life have eliminated those innumerable obstacles by which, in the past, the sons of this world impeded the free action of the Church.”** Those words openly contrast with **St. Pius X’s**, when he complained of a world **“ill with apostasy,”** as well as with **Pius XI’s**, evoking the ill of

atheism, and with Pius XII's, who spoke of this **“evil spirit that won't lay down his arms.”** But John XXIII saw everything **through rose-colored spectacles**, even though the previous year, in 1961, he had seen the shameful **Berlin Wall** rise, and in that same 1962, he had learned of the ominous crisis in Cuba. Had John XXIII shut his eyes upon the tragic communist phenomenon which already in 1846, **Pius IX** called **“a fatal doctrine most opposed to the very natural law,”** and **Pius XI**, in his encyclical **“*Divini Redemptoris*,”** condemned as **“intrinsically perverted,”** adding that **“no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking whatsoever?”**

One would deny that John XXIII had shut his eyes, when, in the month of May 1961, he still spoke of a **“fundamental opposition between Communism and Christianity,”** but shortly afterward John XXIII radically changed. In 1962, acting on his order, Cardinal Tisserant signed an agreement with the Metropolitan **Nikodim**, **spokesman of the Kremlin**, with the aim of inviting Orthodox **“observers”** to his Council. Moscow accepted the invitation on condition that **not a word be uttered about Communism during the Council.** This clarifies why a petition, signed by 450 conciliar Fathers demanding the condemnation of Communism, mysteriously vanished. And thus John XXIII subjected the Church to the veto of Moscow, and put a shameful silence on the bloodiest and criminal of totalitarianisms.

What were the fruits of John XXIII's *Ostpolitik*? Except for the gesture of the release of cardinal Slipyi, in all of the Communist countries there was an increase in anti-Catholic persecutions, where the victims found themselves betrayed by the Vatican Authorities. In Latin America sprang up the so-called **theology of liberation**, permeated with Communist ideas. It will suffice to recall what the

guerrilla-priest Camillo Torres, declared: **“John XXIII authorizes me to march along with the communists.”** Then, in 1963, John XXIII received in the Vatican Khrushchev’s son-in-law, **Alexei Adzhubei**, a meeting arranged by [Comunist Party Secretary] Palmiro Togliatti in person; a **meeting**, however, that earned the Italian communists an extra million votes in the next political elections.

Of the other **sophisms** of pope John XXIII, I will only mention, here, **his odd conception of a mercy that refuses to condemn the error**, as well as his similarly odd tendency – always condemned by the preceding Popes – of promoting a vague **unity**, not evocative of Catholic unity, founded on Faith and Charity, but rather evocative of the **Masonic universal brotherhood**.

Your Excellency, these few pages are intended to be a new **alert** also as regards that **“beatification”** of pope John XXIII planned for September 3, 2000. They outline, in a swift synthesis of chronicle and history – perhaps still unknown to you – a sort of **counter-beatification of John XXIII, the pope of Vatican II**, but also the **pope of the communists**; the pope that **set in motion** at Vatican II the opening of the Church **not only to communism**, but also to the **still ongoing Masonic-styled ecumenism**.

Few perceived John XXIII’s reforming and progressive will, hidden behind his kindly and simplistic countenance, and his personality, full of abilities and diplomatic cunning, irony and congeniality, with which he spiced up his relationships with the people and with his direct collaborators.

It is thus in the conviction of doing something coherent with my conscience of cleric and theologian, that I send, for your information,

these brief flash-writings, a further *tessera* of the great mosaic of the sad history of the Church of today.

John XXIII's "**beatification**" – if regrettably carried out – **will not erase the predicaments he caused, or procured**, as a Pope, with his erroneous and dangerous delusions.

\*\*\*

As he returned to his diocese of Bergamo, after his military service, on December 10, 1918, Roncalli found that things had quite changed since the time he was an omni-present secretary of the Bishop, and though the new Bishop, monsignor Luigi Maria Marella, still allowed him the teaching desk at the Seminary (which had been shaky) and appointed him Spiritual Director of the same Seminary (in spite of the direction, he already retained, of the Hall of Residence), he nonetheless felt "**emarginated by the new Bishop.**"<sup>1</sup>

Roncalli, therefore, was ill at ease, as he could not enjoy the same prestige he enjoyed with his former Bishop, Radini-Tedeschi, and hence Bergamo, by now, was becoming to him too small. And so he set his mind on Rome. The Dutch Cardinal Van Rossem, Prefect of *Propaganda Fide*, would then put him at the re-organization of the missionary works in the Italian dioceses. One might ask oneself: how could a humble Seminary teacher, **suspected of modernism**<sup>2</sup>, be installed in the Roman Curia? The surest answer is that in Rome, at the time, there was no longer Pius X. Without that change, neither Roncalli, from Bergamo, nor Montini, from Brescia, would have ever descended on Rome.

**NUNCIO**

Wrote **Father Bouyer**: “When Monsignor Roncalli was parachuted as a Nuncio to Paris, in quite an unexpected way, **Dom Beauduin** had called on him, not without asking himself whether Giuseppe Roncalli – ring on his finger and purple vest on his shoulders – would still recognize his humiliated brother. His doubt was soon dispelled. He had scarcely handed over his calling card when he heard, from the antechamber, that familiar voice: **‘Come on in, Lamberto! Come on in!’** An instant later, he experienced one of those warm embraces that would be consigned to fame. And before he could grasp what was passing, he heard the Nuncio saying to him, **‘Come! Take a seat and tell me all about your adventures.’** Amicably pushed, Beauduin climbed one step and found himself installed onto a particularly narrow seat. His interlocutor had taken seat on a chair opposite him, laughing his guts out. Beauduin set out, then, with the narration of his Roman tribulations, gradually coming to the realization that he was doing that from the height of the Papal throne which decorates, as a rule, the residence of all Legates. He could hardly envision, at the time, that such a grotesque situation would come to take on a symbolic significance.”<sup>3</sup>

John XXIII stepped down from the throne, during the Council, to let climb on it all those theologians Pius XII had condemned.

Let us not forget **Ernesto Bonaiuti**, defrocked excommunicated head of the Italian modernists, who had been his Seminary mate and assistant at his First Mass<sup>4</sup>, who died April 26, 1946, while Roncalli was in Paris — without sacraments or repentance. And yet Roncalli writes:

**“Dead in such a way, then, at 65, ‘sine luce et sine cruce.’ His admirers wrote of him he was an intensely and profoundly**

**religious spirit, adherent to Christianity with all his fibers, who clung by indestructible bonds to his beloved Catholic Church. Naturally, not an ecclesiastic to bless his body; not a temple to receive his burial! Words from his spiritual testament, between the 18th and the 19th of March 1946: ‘I may have erred. But I cannot find in the substance of my teaching any matter for retraction.’ *Dominus parcat illi!* His last words for Bonaiuti are, in fact, an absolution.”<sup>5</sup>**

Bonaiuti’s death did not mark the end of modernism. Its objective remained always: **to modernize, revise the Church, reconciling her “with progress and modern civilization.”**<sup>6</sup> He [Roncalli] pushed the dogmas into the background, infiltrated his ideas through the **“pastoral,”** through **“movements”**: **liturgical, biblical, ecumenical; in the social field,** favoring the advancement of Marxism, taking advantage of the more progressive episcopates in order to extract concessions from Rome. **Cardinal Suhard** was the leader of Episcopal progressivism. He went as far as to write a **Pastoral Letter** (***“Essor ou déclin de l’Eglise”***) to denounce the danger of integrism, that movement for the defense of the Faith, promoted, blessed and financed by St. Pius X. But that **“letter”** displeased Pius XII, as it was the **“manifest of the new emerging Church.”**<sup>7</sup>

Roncalli’s relationship with Cardinal Suhard is illustrated by Roncalli himself:

**“Nearly five years of spiritual contacts, between us, had sealed a fraternity of sentiment that no shadow, not even the faintest, ever came to upset. Such was our mutual understanding!”**<sup>8</sup>

Hence, by affinity of spirit, he too was **“open to the modern world,”** believer in the necessity of a **dialogue between Catholics**



**and communists, doing away with excommunications;** he, too, was for a renewal of the Church, at every level; a livelier and more active **laity**; a **priesthood** in line with modern life. Several of cardinal Suhard's ideas did indeed find their way in the Giovannean pontificate.

After the French revolution, the Catholic world, to be sure, had been drifting away from Christ; the modern world, that is, **“is out of the fold of Christ,”** it is **“land of mission.”** That obsessed Cardinal Suhard: **“There is a wall separating the Church from the mass. That wall must be leveled at any cost.”** The Dominican **Father Loew** provided the first example, in 1941, when he became a docker at Marseille.<sup>10</sup> One year later, 25 more priests went to work in the **“Mandatory Labor Service”** (STO), in Germany, selected by cardinal Suhard, on advice of **Father Jean-Marie Leblond**. But the outcome defied all expectations. However, on February 5, 1949, Cardinal Suhard published a statement in which he announced **“the habitual and close collaboration with communism”**<sup>11</sup>; hence, a possible collaboration, while Pius XI, in his **encyclical “Divini Redemptoris”** (1937), had declared that **“communism was intrinsically perverted and no collaboration with it could be permitted.”**

At this juncture, Roncalli enters the scene, with the **mediation of Montini**, and the *Osservatore Romano* of 31 March 1949 praises, in an article, the **“Paris Mission”** and Cardinal Suhard, **“who takes full responsibility for it.”** However, the Roman Curia was by now divided: monsignor **Ottaviani and the Holy Office** on one side, and **monsignor Montini** on the other. These are the two coalitions (orthodox and heterodox) that will line up, later, at the Council.

The predilections of monsignor Roncalli went to the French

hierarchy. He approved the “**experiment of the working priests**”<sup>12</sup>; “**he was very fond of the working priests.**”<sup>13</sup>

In 1951, Rome ordered a stop to recruitment; many working priests had opted for **class struggle**, quit priesthood and celibacy. Roncalli’s successor, Marella, had the rest [of the working priests] summoned by their superiors; on June 30, 1949, Pius XII would sign the Decree of the Holy Office of excommunication of the communists. Monsignor Roncalli disappears, leaving to others the interpretation of the Decree. Later, Pius XII would complain for Roncalli’s absence from Paris in such critical moments, and said to Monsignor Marella, Roncalli’s successor at the Nunciature, “**...And, above all, don’t you behave like your predecessor, who was never there.**”<sup>14</sup>

But Roncalli did his best to find a successor to Cardinal Suhard, and this would be **monsignor Feltin**, President of the pacifist movement, *Pax Christi*, a tool of communism. Hebblethwaite grants that monsignor Feltin inspired John XXIII for *Pacem in Terris!*

\*\*\*

Roncalli was somewhat **gluttonous**, ever since his childhood. In imitation of his bishop, Radini-Tedeschi, a capital epicure, young Roncalli was not late in becoming himself a ‘good fork’ [gourmet], and many years later, when he was Nuncio at Paris, he became one of the most sought after diplomats of the French capital, even thanks, in part, to his enthusiasm for convivial gatherings and to the excellent courses served at his table.”<sup>15</sup> Wrote a diplomat that knew him in Paris, “**It was common knowledge that Roncalli, Nuncio, left a strong impression of worldliness, and an unpleasant memory.**”<sup>16</sup>

Be it as it may, his table welcomed all the exponents of “**Catholic**

**progressivism**”; such as **Mauriac**, who voiced his protest when the Holy Office put on the Index the works of Gide, in 1951<sup>17</sup>; such as **Léon Blum**, the socialist Jew who, in 1934, had helped the alliance between socialists and communists, which then came to power in 1936 under the name of **“Popular Front”**<sup>18</sup>; such as **Vincent Auriol**, Finance minister in the first government of the **Popular Front**, and then president of the Fourth Republic, “atheist and socialist”; such as **Eduard Herriot**, mayor of Lyon, President of the Council and of the Socialist Radical Party, always a notorious **anti-clerical**<sup>19</sup>, who sustained to the ultimate consequences the principle of the laity of the State.”<sup>20</sup>

To the latter, one day, Roncalli said:

**“There are but political opinions standing in our way. Trivialities, all in all, wouldn’t you say?”**

One should keep in mind that **Herriot’s** policy (as well as **Auriol’s**) consisted also in the **negation of the “Social Regality” of Jesus Christ and of the rights of the Church, and it implied State atheism.**

It is natural, therefore, that Herriot had then declared, **“If all the Bishops were like Roncalli, there never would have been any anti-clericalism in France.”** Of course! All one need do is to accept the **unconditional surrender** of one’s enemies.

That is why pope Roncalli could boast of having no enemies in the French political world<sup>21</sup>; but he failed to realize he had succeeded even there where **Our Lord Jesus Christ** had not<sup>22</sup>, and neither had **St. Paul**<sup>23</sup>, nor had any good Christian<sup>24</sup>.

When on March 3, 1925, he was elected Archbishop of Aeropoli, with the assignment of Apostolic Visitor to Bulgaria (accounting for only 62,000 Catholics), one of his friends, **Dom Lambert Beauduin** O. S. B., said that **“Roncalli had been removed from his teaching post at the Lateran as he was suspected of modernism,”** as he had similarly been removed from the Seminary of Bergamo. That transfer put monsignor Roncalli on the path of ecumenism nonetheless, **“opened the first horizons of his future ecumenism”**<sup>25</sup>.

Dom Beauduin, introduced, already, to ecumenism with the Orthodox, having founded a **“Monastery of the Union”** first at Amay-sur-Meuse and, subsequently, at Chevetogne, adopting the Oriental liturgy **“in order that Catholicism might no longer be confused with Latinism,”**<sup>26</sup> followed him as a Secretary. A magazine of the monastery, *Irénikon*, divulged those ideas of muddle-headed ecumenism, which Roncalli read however with enthusiasm, as Hebblethwaite demonstrates: **“Roncalli’s first letter on ecumenism cites in fact ‘Irénikon’”**. And it is significant that the letter was addressed to a non-cleric, **Adelaide Coari**; a laywoman interested in ecumenical, biblical, and women’s movements, and that was preoccupied with the fate of **Ernesto Bonaiuti**, excommunicated former Seminary mate of Roncalli. Moreover, this woman was interested in the union of the Churches and she was fond of the spirit of charity of *Irénikon* magazine, which entrusted the return of the brothers to the unity of the fold to the charity of the Catholics. **Roncalli, therefore, wanted “charity” more than scientific and theological discussions,** an anti-intellectual approach, as it were, derogatory toward theology. Beauduin, in an *“Irénikon”* issue, had developed the **primacy of charity**, since what is wanted, wrote he, is **“a living apologetic that requires no other miracle but love.”**<sup>27</sup>

But such **primacy of charity** has nothing to do with **St. Paul**, to

whom charity presupposes the right faith, whereas, on the contrary, Beauduin's resembles the Protestant ecumenist association that was given the name, in 1925, of "**Life and Work**," which **pursued the union not on the doctrinal level, but on the practical one of pseudo-charity**. We are in 1927. On January 6, 1928, however, out came **Pius XI's** encyclical "*Mortalium Animos*," condemning that ecumenism. Beauduin had to resign as a Prior of the Monastery of Amay, and, in 1929, he was summoned to Rome. Then, in 1932, he had another trial and was exiled to Encalcat. Why? The first fruits of the **Monastery of the Union**, which he had founded, were by now visible: not a few of the Catholic monks had apostatized in order to join the Orthodox. While Rome condemned Dom Lambert Beauduin's method, Roncalli, on the other hand, as a Pope, would say, "**Dom Lambert Beauduin's method is the good one.**"

That much, Beauduin already knew. In fact, in 1958, he had said, "**If they elected Roncalli (pope), all would be saved: he would be capable of convening a Council and consecrate ecumenism.**"<sup>28</sup> As it punctually happened. Vatican II emanated, on 20 September 1964, the *De Oecumenismo: Unitatis Redintegratio*. The formulas of that ecumenism, condemned by Pius XII, are in fact those approved by Vatican II.<sup>29</sup>

Not surprisingly, **John XXIII called to the Council**, as an expert, precisely the Dominican **Congar**, although his **false Irenism** had already been condemned by Pius XII, both as a doctrine and as a method; and yet that was in fact the principal activity of monsignor Roncalli in the Balkans.

When he [Roncalli] moved on to Turkey, in the conference he had with the [Turkish] undersecretary of foreign affairs, **Numan Rifat Menemengioglu**, after the undersecretary had said to him, "**The laity**

**of the State is one of our fundamental principles,”** monsignor Roncalli replied: **“The Church shall be careful not to affect or discuss such laity.”** It was a very grave affirmation, to come from the lips of a representative of Pius XI, who, in his encyclical **“*Quas Primas*”** (6 December 1925), on the social regality of Christ, had written: **“the plague infecting society (...), the plague of our time is laicism, its errors and its impious attempts.”**

\*\*\*

And again: **“we Catholics believe that, in the Blessed Trinity, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and from the Son”** (*qui ex Patre Filioque procedit*), hence, **not only from the Father.** We chant it in the **Creed of the Mass** and during the **“Tantum Ergo”** of the Eucharistic Blessing (*procedenti ab utroque*). Instead, **“Roncalli’s pastoral and ecumenical vocation grew more and more evident through various highly significant acts, such as the cancellation of the ‘Filioque’ that, in open polemic with the ‘orthodox’, had been written, in great evidence, on the entrance of the Apostolic Delegation”**<sup>30</sup>.

Moreover, he multiplied the meetings with the members of the Orthodox hierarchy. Having Greece, too, under his jurisdiction, a country with an anti-Catholic legislation, following a meeting, in Athens, between Orthodox and Anglicans, in which the validity of the Holy Orders of the Anglican Church was acknowledged, Monsignor Roncalli, instead of reacting – if with a reference to Leo XIII’s sentence – came out to say, **“I do not regret that our separated brothers have made the first step toward unity.”**<sup>31</sup>

# CARDINAL

On November 14, 1952, Montini writes him [Roncalli] whether, in case of death of the Patriarch of Venice, monsignor Carlo Agostini, gravely ill, he would be ready to succeed him. Following his [Roncalli's] consent, a telegram, again from Montini, announces to him his appointment to cardinal in the upcoming Consistory of 12 January 1953. After the death of the Patriarch of Venice, Roncalli would succeed him, on December 28.

In his speech of 15 March 1953 at St. Mark's Basilica, on the very day of his arrival in the diocese of Venice, he would say he **“always rather cared about that which unites than about that which separates and generates contrasts.”**<sup>32</sup> A real ecumenist speech, in the sense explained by the mason Baron Marsaudon,<sup>33</sup> in an expression Monsignor Roncalli had already used with the representative of the Turkish Government, Numan Rifat Menengioglu: **“I'm an optimist. I always seek in any thing to develop that which unites rather than that which draws apart.”**<sup>34</sup> And that would become his emblematic phrase, his inspiring principle.

In his first encyclical, *“Ecclesiam Suam,”* the encyclical of the **“dialogue”**, Paul VI would write, **“We willingly make it our principle: we emphasize, first of all, that which is common to us, before we take notice of that which divides us.”** A principle, however, that does not coincide with the doctrine of the Church. In *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (42-0950-142-147), for example, one reads: **“They (the Bishops) will also guard that, under the false pretext by which one is to consider that which unites over that which**

**separates us, a dangerous indifferentism be not encouraged.”<sup>35</sup>**

I would have you note: what to Paul VI was a **principle**, to the Holy Office was in fact that very **false pretext**. Cardinal Roncalli, too, thus supported a **principle** the Holy Office, three years earlier, had condemned as **false**. It must be noted that such principle was applied to **people of different religions and ideologies**, namely: **infidels, heretics, schismatic, atheists, masons, communists**, etc. And what unites? **Human reasons**. And what separates? **Different Faith**. Consequently, it is aberrant to place purely human, natural values on a higher standing than supernatural values. Therefore, Roncalli’s clarification makes no sense: **safe is the steadfastness to the principles of the Catholic Creed and of Morals**, since what divides us are in fact the principles of the Catholic Creed and of Morals.

This manner of speaking serves but to sugar a pill. It was the same tactic adopted in Vatican II, when a similar locution was used to promulgate **religious Freedom**, declaring that no one intended to change the traditional doctrine, whereas, in fact, the entire Tradition was being revolutionized.

The **Grand Master Di Bernardo**, speaking of **tolerance**, says the same: It is “**an approach that, even rejecting, in line of principle, an erroneous way of thinking, allows it to subsist on account of the respect due to others’ freedom.**”<sup>36</sup> The mason, that is, “is not indifferent toward other ways of thinking; Freemasonry is not all and the contrary of all.” but it is, “by its own nature, not exclusivist or pluralist”. Ergo, the arguing of cardinal Roncalli in that sense, we may define a **Masonic speaking**, regardless of his alleged initiation in a Lodge.



He was **open** with all (other religions, ideologies...). **In religion, with ecumenism; in politics, with his opening to the left.**

And he was always **ecumenist**, ever since the 1920's, not in the traditional theological sense, but in the sense that would come to characterize the Council, and which brought him to say, **“can the responsibility of the split be attributed entirely to our separated brothers? It is, in part, theirs, but, for a great part, it rests with us”**<sup>37</sup>. (during a conference he held at Palermo, 18 September 1957, during the study-week on the **Christian Orient**). He surely ignored the fact that **Pius IX had already condemned the thesis according to which the Popes' deliberations to bring about the schism.**<sup>38</sup> □

# POPE



How did it ever occur to him to convene a Council? And what was his purpose?

In an Allocution to the Venetian pilgrims of May 8, 1962, John XXIII revealed that the idea occurred to him, **all of a sudden**, during a colloquy with his Secretary of State<sup>39</sup>.

He is even more categorical in his **spiritual Diary**:

**“Without giving it a thought, there popped out, in a first discussion with my Secretary of State, on January 20, 1959, the words of Ecumenical Council...”**<sup>40</sup>.

That is what everyone believed, so much so that **Paul VI**, on September 29, 1963, would state that the Ecumenical Council had been convened and initiated **“by divine direction.”**<sup>41</sup>

**John Paul II** would make a similar statement on November 25, 1981:

**“... He tied his name to the greatest and transforming event of our century: the call of Vatican II Ecumenical Council, which he perceived, as he declared, as a mysterious and irresistible inspiration of the Holy Spirit...”**<sup>42</sup>

That was the official version, totally false!

A falsity that, today, historians have come to accept, even though they have a hard time avoiding addressing Roncalli with the epithet of “**liar.**”<sup>43</sup> Even the Jesuit father Giacomo Martina thus describes the facts: “According to the *Giornale dell’Anima* and to a speech of May 8, 1962, John XXIII would have conceived the intention (of convening a Council) as a result of a sudden inspiration, which struck him during a discussion with his Secretary of State, Cardinal Tardini, on January 20, 1959. The autobiographical statement (**which airs singular issues as to the reliability of the *Giornale dell’Anima* and the character of the Pope**) is however contradicted by many testimonies, several of which go back to the Pope himself.”<sup>44</sup>

There are, however, indications - more than indications, in fact – that prior to January 20, 1959, Roncalli was thinking of a Council, even before he was elected Pope. Let us recall the “**testimony**” of that friend of his (since 1924), **Dom Lambert Beauduin**, who, upon the death of Pius XII, told his close friends, “**If they elected Roncalli, all would be saved: he would be capable of convening a Council and consecrate ecumenism.**”<sup>45</sup>

Cardinal Ottaviani stated, on at least two occasions, in 1968 and 1975, that a Council had been discussed during the Conclave, prior to Roncalli’s election; rather, the cardinals Ottaviani and Ruffini, in the company of others, on the night of 27 October 1958 called on Monsignor’s Roncalli’s cell to propose an Ecumenical Council.<sup>46</sup> And cardinal Roncalli, according to cardinal Ottaviani, appropriated the idea of a Council — **before his election**. Two days after his election (October 30), John XXIII spoke to his Secretary, Capovilla, of the “**necessity of convening a Council.**” And even before his coronation, on November 2, after granting an audience to Cardinal Ruffini and discussing the issue, he again said to Capovilla, “**A Council is wanted.**” Again in November, he discussed it with the

new Patriarch of Venice, Giovanni Urbani and, subsequently, with the Bishop of Padua, Girolamo Bordignon. **“On November 28, the decision is taken,”** and **“Pope John XXIII’s decision of holding a Council becomes final in the December of 1958.”** Round about Christmas, he discussed it with his confessor, Monsignor Cavagna, together with three other people. On the morning of January 9, he met Monsignor Giovanni Rossi, of the *Pro Civitate Christiana* and told him, **“I must tell you about a great thing, but you must promise me it will remain between us. Tonight a great idea occurred to me: to do a Council.”** Monsignor Rossi, for a time, kept Roncalli’s confession to himself, then he made mention of it in his bulletin, *La Rocca* of 15 January 1958.<sup>47</sup>

Therefore, **John XXIII lied** when he said the idea of a Council had fallen upon him during a colloquy with his Secretary of State, Cardinal Tardini, on January 20, as Tardini was, in fact, one of the last to learn about it, just 5 days, in fact, ahead of the historical announcement,<sup>48</sup> so much so that Cardinal Tardini realized **“he was before a *fait accompli*, a decision already taken.”** Father Martina comments on it, too: **“It is a singular evidence of the nature of the relationship of the pope with his Secretary of State, cordial and yet shallow, that this [Tardini] should come to know of his intention only on January 20, when the pontiff had already irrevocably decided the initiative and had compiled the first subsequent draft.”**<sup>49</sup> Even the British journalist Wilton Wynn expresses the same concept as the Jesuit Martina, as well as the former Jesuit Hebblethwaite: **“Pope John XXIII regularly managed to work his way around his old enemy Tardini. As a Secretary of State, Tardini should have been the closest collaborator of the pope. But John XXIII did not work through the ‘official’ channels, preferring, instead, to work with persons more consonant with his character, whom he trusted without**

**reserve.”**<sup>50</sup> Pope Roncalli, that is, was also fond of the tactic of the two tracks. And, therefore, on January 25, 1959, John XXIII went to St. Paul’s Basilica Outside the Walls. His **“face was anxious and tense.”** The function over, at around one p.m. the 17 Cardinals present were summoned in the capitulary hall of the Benedictine abbey. There the Pope held for them an Allocution, at the end of which he uttered the fatidic announcement:

**“My venerable Brothers of the Cardinalitial College! I pronounce, in your presence, certainly quivering a little with commotion, but at the same time with humble resoluteness of purpose, the name and the proposal of the double celebration of a Diocesan Synod for Rome and of an Ecumenical Council for the universal Church.”**<sup>51</sup>

And what kind of a Council he had in mind became clear through his words:

**“... In welcoming and renewed invitation to our brothers of the separated Churches to participate with us in this feast of grace and fraternity...”**

It must be noted that **the official version of that address** appeared with the following meaningful variation:

**“... in renewed invitation to the faithful of the separated communities to follow us in this quest for unity and grace, which so many souls yearn for from all corners of the world.”**

As one can see, the changes are not of little moment; in fact: the separated Christians are no longer called **“brothers”**; they now belong to a **“community,”** but not to **“Churches”**; and, in lieu of

participating with us in this feast of grace and fraternity, they are exhorted to seek and follow the Catholics in this quest, as though they could not do otherwise.<sup>52</sup>

It was, in fact, a Council not only ecumenical, but also ecumenist.

The Cardinals, however, responded with a **“remarkable devout silence”**. John XXIII **“remained bitterly disappointed,”** as he himself attested, when he wrote:

**“One could humanly suppose that, after hearing the allocution, the cardinals would close ranks around us in order to convey their approval and good wishes.”<sup>53</sup>**

But the bewilderment of the Cardinals was also shared in many other sectors, both ecclesiastical and secular. **Cardinal Lercaro** went so far as to write: **“How dare he convoke a Council one hundred years after the last one and only three months after his election? Pope John reveals his imprudence and rashness.”<sup>54</sup>** And he pursued, saying, **“Such an event will ruin his already poor health, and cause the whole edifice of the moral and theological virtues attributed to him, to crumble to the ground.”<sup>55</sup>**

**John XXIII’s imprudence in convening a Council** appears all the more serious in the awareness that **Pius XI and Pius XII had shunned** the idea of calling a Council, for the very grave consequences such Council would bring about, given the modernist climate **cardinal Billot**, having being consulted by **Pius XI**, had expressed in following terms:

**“(…) The resumption of the Council** (Vatican I, suspended in the imminence of the Franco-Prussian war on 18 July 1870) **is desired**

by the worst enemies of the Church, namely, by the modernists, who are preparing to take advantage of the General States of the Church in order to carry out a revolution, a new '89, the object of their dreams and of their hopes. Needless to say, they will meet with failure, but we will again come to know the days so sadly familiar of the end of the pontificate of Leo XIII and of the onset of that of Pius X; and worse yet, we will even see the annihilation of the happy fruits of the Encyclical '*Pascendi*,' which had reduced them [modernists] into silence."

Such was the view of numerous other Cardinals. Hence, Pius XI abandoned the idea of convening the Council, and so did Pius XII, sufficing with the condemnation of the existing errors through the encyclical "*Humani Generis*," a real *summa* of the doctrine of the Church on the problems posed by the modern world.

But John XXIII, too, had to be aware of what was happening all around, of the situation and of the hazards that could derive from it [Council] for the Faith. But he had it his own way, without and against the opinion of many. **How not to think, therefore, to a Roncalli - member of an anti-Christian sect** that dreamed of a revolutionary Council in order to destroy the Church? Or how not to think to a **pro-modernist Roncalli** who wanted a Council in order to translate the ideas of his friend Dom Beauduin into reality? Or else, how not to think to an "**imprudent**" man who, instead of accepting to be a "**Pope of transition**," wanted to leave his own legacy in the history of the Church? Be that as it may, **John XXIII is certainly principally responsible for the departure from, and discontinuity with, the previous infallible Magisterium of the Church.** His interventions during the preparatory stages of the Council, first, and subsequently during its progress, were decisive for its further developments. Pontificate and Council intertwined, weighed heavily

on each other in order to **lead toward the embrace with the “world.”**

\*\*\*

It is already apparent in his opening address to the Council, where he openly sided with the revisionist current, whose objective was, for example, in the liturgical reform, nothing short of the demolition of the Roman Rite. Wrote [cardinal] Bea, one day before the election of John XXIII, **“Nothing can be said, at this time, about the reform. The first question is what kind of approach will the new Pope take on the matter. In fact, not all the cardinals were agreed that the reform should be carried out.”**<sup>56</sup> A few days earlier, while Pius XII was dying, Dom Lambert Beauduin, the leader of the ecumenical (and liturgical) movement, condemned already by Pius XI with his *“Mortalium Animos,”* said to Father Bouyer, in the abbey of Chevetogne, **“If they elected Roncalli, all would be saved: he would be capable of convening a Council and consecrate ecumenism... I’m confident, it is our chance; the majority of the cardinals don’t know what to do. They might vote for him.”** But the death of the Roman Liturgy was decided, too.<sup>57</sup> And not only that.

Instead of the **spring of the Church** and of the **new Pentecost, powerful breath of the Holy Spirit**, and instead of dispersing the **darkness of error**, as on Good Friday, **“darkness came over the whole land (...) because of an eclipse of the sun”** (Lk. 23, 44-45).

And Vatican II, instead of a repetition of the **“Syllabus against the principal errors of our age”**, as the best theologians expected, was to all an illusion, **for the very fact that “a Council of censure was in contrast with the line of Pope John XXIII.”**



The attempt of the Roman Curia to check and curb his [John XXIII's] directives proved futile. When given account of the progress of the preparatory work, John XXIII commented that **“the preparation of the Council would not be the work of the Roman Curia,”** and at the Pentecost meeting of 5 June 1960 he made a clear distinction between Curia and Council.<sup>58</sup> Before the aloofness and resistance of many **cardinals (out of 74, in fact, only 24 expressed, in writing, adhesions and proposals)** John XXIII wanted and succeeded, in part, to work his way around or pass over the Curia, deciding a consultation with the entire episcopate. 77% of a far from acquiescent episcopate responded. But Pope XXIII was not interested in that. All he cared about was the opinion of his great friend, **Giovanni Battista Montini.**

As an evidence of that, here is the letter he [John XXIII] wrote Cardinal Montini on April 4, 1961: **“I should write all the bishops, archbishops and cardinals of the world... But, in order to reach every one of them, I’m satisfied with writing to the archbishop of Milan, since, with him, I carry them all in my heart, and to me he represents them all.”**<sup>59</sup>

Disconcerting! A Montini who, to John XXIII, represented all of the episcopate,<sup>60</sup> and precisely that Montini Pius XII had absolutely not wanted to become a Pope.

\*\*\*

Wrote **Jean Guitton** (Pantheist and Bergsonian), **friend of G. B. Montini**, **“Pius XII knew it, he himself said he was the ‘last Pope’, the last link of a long chain.”**<sup>61</sup> And yet in those years 1950s, the Church was thriving. But **Pius XII knew an unprecedented crisis was in the making “in the very bosom of the Church,”** as Pius X

had already said. And that came about, in fact, with the election of John XXIII. Modernism exploded violent, in spite of the **“*Humani Generis*”** (1950). **Jacques Maritain** shared this view: **“The modernism of the time of Pius X, compared with the modern neo-modernist fever, was but a mere hay-fever.”**<sup>62</sup> In fact, with Pope John XXIII the situation was reversed. The progressive popped out everywhere.

From that Conclave that elected him, in the afternoon of 28 October 1958, on the eleventh ballot, some unofficial **“news”** leaked out which might be cause for reflection. Could one exclude, in his [John XXIII’s] election, a Masonic influence? The very name he took of **“John XXIII”**, according to the freemason **Pier Carpi**, would be the **esoteric and Rosicrucian name taken in the Lodge**<sup>63</sup>. In any case, it is certain that his mason friend, the Baron **Marsaudon**, wrote, **“To us (freemasons) it was a great emotion (his election to pope), but, to many of our friends it was a sign.”**<sup>64</sup> Of recognition?

Another fact: John XXIII, just after his election, telephoned Monsignor Montini: **“Excellency, I’m keeping your place warm.”**<sup>65</sup>

**One of his earliest acts, then, would be to make Montini cardinal and say: “Montini, the first fruit of our pontificate.”**

Even on his deathbed, on May 31, 1963, John XXIII would recommend his beloved Montini:

**“I believe it will be cardinal Montini; upon him should converge the votes of the Holy College.”**<sup>66</sup>

Pope John XXIII, therefore, was only the precursor of Pope Paul VI, who will carry out that disastrous revision in the Church which

make Pius XII's words to the French Ambassador to the Vatican sound prophetic: **“After me, the deluge.”**<sup>67</sup>

It was the announcement of the **new era of the Church**. The very first day following the election, John XXIII pronounced his first radio-message to the world, *“Hac trepida ora,”* in which he spoke of the (communist) persecutions against the Catholic Church, **“in open contrast”** with **“modern civilization”** and long acquired **“human rights.”**<sup>68</sup>

But he then praised **modern civilization**, with which, however, according to Pius IX, the Pope could never come to a compromise and reconciliation.<sup>69</sup> In any case, why praise **human rights** as acquired in the Declaration of 1789?

As a consequence, he promptly received the heartfelt wishes of the Chief Rabbi of Israel, **Isaac Herzog**, Anglican archbishop **Geoffrey Fischer**, **Paul Robinson**, president of the federated Churches, and the wishes of the Head of the Russian Orthodox Church, **Patriarch Alexei**.

Hence, we can say that that message was a real programmatic address, as it conveys the two principal themes that would mark his [John XXIII's] pontificate: **unity, in the life of the Church, and peace, in the order of the world.**<sup>70</sup> Namely:

**Unity = ecumenism.**

**Peace = pacifism – opening to the left.**

After that message, John XXIII presently thought of appointing new Cardinals. Obviously, the first, whom he personally dictated, was **Monsignor Montini**, although he knew that Pius XII had kicked

him out of Vatican, and wanted him excluded from the Conclave, and for that reason he had refused him the purple habit. And we still suffer the consequences of John XXIII's action.

That, too, is a clear indication that John XXIII, far from having been a Pope of transition, was a real reformist and transformer, such as the Church had never known since the days of the Counter-Reformation<sup>71</sup>. A **new revised Church**, today called "**Conciliar**" (*quod dixit* Cardinal Benelli).

But in the Church, the Pope is omnipotent. And so even the dream of the neo-modernist revolution, which was precisely that of drawing a "**Pope**" to its side, becomes understandable. But it was also the dream of the Freemasonry of Nubius and Volpe, in the past century, such as [Italian writer] Fogazzaro had expressed in "**Saint.**"<sup>72</sup>

A "**dream**", and yet a dream that took "**shape**" with John XXIII.

Was he not called the "**Papa Buono?**" In fact, the progressives made of him their prophet and the people considered him a "**saint.**" And that facilitated the acceptance of his **religious revolution**. Ever since the early days of his pontificate, in fact, he upset rules and laws, customs and century-old compartments. He struck suddenly and in so violent a manner as to leave everybody speechless. The secular broadsheets, as a consequence, made of him a front-page phenomenon.<sup>73</sup> The world had found in him a **new Pope**, but also a **new Church**.<sup>74</sup>

He himself underscored, not without mischievousness, his differences with Pius XII,<sup>75</sup> and his admirers would refer to that text in order to substantiate their dreams.<sup>76</sup>

His popularity rating with the masses reached the apex with his visit to the *Bambin Gesù* Hospital, and, the following day, to the Roman detention center of *Regina Coeli*. Acts every Pope of the past had performed, even when Rome was the capital of their States. And yet these acts of Pope John XXIII were praised as innovative. The head of the Milanese modernists, **Gallarati Scotti**, even saw in John XXIII the **Saint** of the homonym novel of Fogazzaro, included into the Index by St. Pius X. Therefore, wrote he [Gallarati Scotti] to the Pope, “... **I implore Your Holiness to step out of Vatican...**” And so it was! Many walkouts, neither timid nor pious, followed one after the other. To visit the ill and the convicts are, to be sure, deeds of mercy, but was that **goodness** (or affability?) of Pope John XXIII not exaggerated and distorted? He loved, to be sure, the foes of the Church, but much less he loved those disagreeable to him as, for example, **Father Mattiussi, Father Lombardi, and Cardinal Ottaviani**, whom he made the object of his rather heavy gibes.

And he did not spare a trick or two upon the memory of Pius XII. And with **Padre Pio**, his relationship was certainly far from idyllic. In 1923, already, while passing through Foggia as the national director of the Pontifical Missionary Works, invited to call on San Giovanni Rotondo, he declined.<sup>77</sup> And when, in the *Settimana Incom*, in a long journalistic service it was written that, among other things, Pope John XXIII had defined Padre Pio a **saint**, and that the Capuchin had even predicted his election to Pope, on August 16, he wrote in his own hand to his secretary, monsignor Loris Capovilla, from Castel Gandolfo:

**“Would you please write, privately, on my behalf, to monsignor Andrea Ceserano, archbishop of Mafredonia, that what was written on “Incom” about the relationship between Padre Pio and me, is an utter invention. I have never had any association**

**with him, nor have I met him or written to him, nor has it ever occurred to me to send him any blessing, nor was I ever asked, directly or indirectly, to do so, either before or after the Conclave, or ever. As soon as monsignor Dell'Acqua is back, we should see to it that a stop be put to these fabrications, which do no honor to anyone."**

In addition: on July 19, 1960, monsignor Maccari met John XXIII, who gave him the assignment of an **Apostolic Visit** to San Giovanni Rotondo, already decided on July 13. And the Pope then followed closely this sad **affair** which ended negatively for Padre Pio (accused even of immorality), with disciplinary measures against him.

It must be known: shortly before that **Apostolic Visit, a sacrilegious recording of confessions held by Padre Pio had been made**; a recording decided by **monsignor Terenzi**, parish priest of the *Divino Amore* [famous Virgin Mary's Sanctuary], in Rome, and executed by some Capuchins, with the cover of an Excellency from the Holy Office. **Well, John XXIII, too, was said to be "guilty" of that "sacrilegious recording."** Monsignor Capovilla, in a letter to father **Antonio Cairoli** (postulator of the Cause of John XXIII), on November 6, 1986, calls that statement **"insulting and slanderous,"** but then he adds, **"... when at the end of the (Apostolic) Visit, the Pope asked me whether I had listened to the recordings of the 'wiretaps,' and I replied that I had refused to do it, he confided to me that he had not done it either"**.

Hence **the Pope knew of those sacrilegious wiretaps (...).** The Pope refused to listen to them, but they had made it, however, to his antechamber. It is deduced in fact by a **"denial" of Monsignor Maccari,** toward the close of his memorial.<sup>78</sup>

It was, however, a very grave action, one deserving of the intervention of the Holy Office.

And yet, **John XXIII tolerated that sacrilege, as he was aware of it**, and, subsequently, in lieu of punishing the offenders, he punished the victim. Poor Padre Pio! And on the occasion of his 50 years of Mass, he [Padre Pio] never received a telegram of congratulation from Vatican, whereas two other friars received the telegram on that very day. Moreover, he was also denied the faculty of imparting the papal blessing, while Pius XII had granted it to him on two occasions, between 1957 and 1958. And he was even denied a simple Apostolic blessing. In addition, *Osservatore Romano* was ordered not to mention Padre Pio's 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Mass.<sup>79</sup>

Now, is this the “Pope” they intend to “beatify?” □

\*\*\*

**The Holy Office**, as it is widely known, **came into being in 1542, against Luther, and lasted up until 1964, when Montini suppressed it.** Now, John XXIII held the Holy Office, as well as the Roman Curia, in no esteem. **Cardinal Suenens** reported the following witticism of John XXIII's:

**“The Holy Office is doing what it can in order to pin down heresies in my writings and in my projects... but it has yet to succeed.”<sup>80</sup>**

Such ill-disguised hostility contained in Roncalli numerous motives: his disposition, filled with liberal and modernizing ideas, his youth experiences... Cardinal De Lai offered him **“healthy advises”**, which he [Roncalli] found, however, always annoying and irritating.

His personal secretary, monsignor Capovilla, affirmed that **Roncalli** felt “repulsion” for **Pius X’s anti-modernist policy**<sup>81</sup>.

Even **Indro Montanelli**, in an article in the *Corriere della sera*, reported on an interview with John XXIII:

«He told me “monsignor Radini-Tedeschi utterly disliked the Roman Curia, so much so that he had once asked him [Roncalli], who had never set foot in Rome, to deliver the fruits of I don’t know what subscription to the Holy Pope. ‘The Holy Pope’, I had interposed, ‘Saint my foot!’ He jumped up in anger. I was flabbergasted. Then I put in, inconsiderately, ‘I haven’t made him a saint, you did!’ Perhaps, the Pope was grateful to me for my third-rate comedian witticism, which automatically played down his own. He laughed, and, patting my arm, he rejoined, ‘Why, everybody knows he was a Saint, but a somewhat unusual saint, for he was a sad man. The Saints are not supposed to be sad: they have God...’”».

This explains the obstinate grudge John XXIII bore against the dossiers the Holy Office maintained on him, which led him to rehabilitate the “victims” of the time<sup>82</sup> hitting the “persecutors”, and attempting to ditch all the institutions fighting modernism, starting with the Holy Office.

Obviously, at first, the clash could not be frontal. He [John XXIII] used, then, the policy of the **two tracks**. And so he did with the **Holy Office** and with the **Biblical Institute** and with the **Roman Curia**. He went so far as to deny any further audience to Cardinal Ottaviani (he, the “*Papa buono*”!), and even concocting his removal from the cardinalate.<sup>83</sup> Paul VI, then, saw to the suppression of the Holy Office and deprived Ottaviani’s title of any consequence, by denying the



Conclave vote to octogenarian Cardinals. And so the “*Palazzaccio*” [evil palace] was defeated. Once the “**police**” were suppressed, the spiritual thieves and assassins had free rein all through the Church.

For good reasons, was his Pontificate called “of **transition**,” that is, of fracture with the old equilibrium toward a new form. But that “**ecumenical bridge**” of his had failed to reckon the corrosive power of the ferments, soaring also from the clergy – influenced by the massive propaganda of the International Left. Corrosion John XXIII failed to estimate, oblivious of the tremendous capacity of the abysses. As a consequence, all the weak spirits, the defenders of the **world**, the **progressive priests**, the Catholics captivated by the **Lapiriani** [from Giorgio La Pira, Catholic mayor of Floreice (early 1950s & 60s) nicknamed the “white communist” as he sided with the predominantly socialist and communist working class] funambulism and by the so called advanced **elites**, were swallowed up into that **black hole**.

\*\*\*

You, Your Excellency, would certainly recall that cardinal Tardini himself, then pope John XXIII’s Secretary of State, did state that that idea of the Council made him consider John XXIII “**temporarily mad**,” and that because cardinal Tardini was well acquainted with the existing problems of the **Church** and of the **world**, and the ferments in the clergy, and the dangerous oscillations of certain foreign Episcopates, and that many, outside and inside the Curia, thought that a Council should not have been convened in so unstable and tumultuous a time. Dangerous it was! And such it proved to be. Since the very first Session, the impetus of the polemics shook that “ecumenical bridge” with yearnings of **sociological modernism** and rendered it unstable under the thrust of opposing tendencies. Anti-

conformist wretches, backed up or tolerated by the Top; a surfacing pacifist “**democratic Church**” that wanted to accommodate, ready to deal with traditional enemies, granting ample breadth and drive to **neo-modernism** and even **communism**, which presently cloaked itself with a false understanding of the rights of Religion, using the method of “**distension**” toward the Church.

This new climate was recognized and approved by Moscow. The Soviet magazine *Nauka i Religia*, under the signature of Anatoli Krassikov, on 14 August 1963, commented, “**The Ecumenical Council, resuming its works on September 29, has already shown that in the ecclesiastical hierarchies there exists a strong tendency which rejects Pius XII’s old methods.**” It [magazine] then gave credit to John XXIII for being a “**wise and farsighted politician, who realistically perceived the changes taking place in the world and knew how to take into due consideration the imperatives of the time...**” The objectives of international Marxism were thus revealed. Recall with what benevolence Pope John XXIII received **Adzhubei**, one of the **new barbarians**, the communists, whom Pope John fancied to bring into accepting the imperious order of St. Remigius: “Sigambrian, henceforward burn what thou hast worshipped, and worship what thou hast burned,” but who, instead, pronounced, shortly after, on 12 September 1963, blasphemous declarations against Catholicism, at the microphones of Radio Moscow.

But Pope John XXIII continued to believe he could win them over through goodness. His encyclical “*Pacem in Terris*” had become the **sound track** of the Marxist propaganda, and the communists had printed millions of copies of **chapter V**, which contains the norms for the political alliances, to distribute them in all the nations. Unfortunately, that encyclical would shatter the last diaphragms still

separating Christianity from communism, creating the great misunderstanding that would undermine the foundations of the Church, inviting her, explicitly, to the encounter, to the dialogue, to acceptance.

Seventeen days after the promulgation of that encyclical, on May 1, 1963, in Italy took place the political elections, and the response, unequivocal, to “*Pacem in Terris*” was the increase upwards of a million votes to the Italian Communist Party (PCI) with respect to the previous vote five years earlier. **It was over one million votes presented complete with blessing** to the representatives of official atheism. When the results of the vote became clear, an excited throng of communists packed St. Peter’s square, shouting, “**Long live John XXIII. Long live the Pope of the peace!**”

John XXIII, from that day on, was like a puppet. He was by now an absentee. He was worn out. His physicians had informed him that he had only about a year to live, a death sentence that gave him the shivers, made his blood run cold. Those around him saw him weep, at times. But by now the communist throng had him in their hands, even, twenty-five days before his death, presenting him with the **Balzan Prize** for peace.

He intended to decline it, but he was literally dragged from his bed, dressed in his papal vestments, and hoisted into the Sistine Chapel, it being impossible to carry him into St. Peter’s, given his dreadful condition. He was pale, distraught, his lifeless eyes fastened on emptiness; and, as he was placed on the throne, he shivered a long time. But there were others to smile, namely, the representatives of that “**award**”, invented **in 1945** with the moneys **of the slain under the red regime**; and there was his Secretary, monsignor Capovilla, with his large funereal shades, continuously smiling to the paparazzi.

Back in his apartment, John XXIII refused any other visit. On the eve of his death he had, I am certain, an atonement, as it were. Some heard him moan in despair for what he had done. Before breathing his last, he spelled out, word after word, the **profession of Faith to the Catholic religion**, and whispered, **“I’m dying sacrificed like the Lamb.”**

Why? To whom had he alluded? Outside, the rotary presses of the Italian Communist party worked day and night, to distribute tons and tons of laudatory obituary on the **“pope of the Marxists.”** Not even Stalin’s death had occasioned as much.

\*\*\*

In any case, the legacy left by John XXIII will turn out to be much heavier than had been anticipated. His political action, in favor of the opening to the left, was always on the same wave-length as the action of Monsignor Montini, who, of such opening, would be the principal advocate in order to realize the **ideological coexistence with the socialist world**, through a one-sided **religious softening**. And that also clarifies John XXIII’s opening toward the **Sillon** (the Furrow), directed by **Marc Sangnier** which **St. Pius X** had condemned, on 25 August 1910, with the Letter **“Notre Charge Apostolique”**:

**“Every member of the Sillon, as such, works but for one sect, the Sillon, its eyes fixed on a chimera, it brings Socialism in its train.”** It is a **“miserable affluent of the great movement of apostasy being organized in every country for the establishment of a One-World Church which shall have neither dogmas, nor hierarchy (...) and which, under the pretext of freedom and human dignity, would bring back to the world (...) the reign of legalized cunning and force.”**

But as a Nuncio, upon **Marc Sangnier's** death, he had written the widow the following letter:

**“Dear Madam: I first spoke of Marc Sangnier in Rome, toward 1903 or 1904, at a gathering of the Catholic Youth. The powerful appeal of his word, of his soul, had captivated me, and I hold of his person and of his political and social activity the most vivid memory of my priestly youth. His noble and great humbleness in accepting, in 1910, the admonition, in fact very affectionate and benevolent (sic!) of the holy Pope Pius X, gives my eyes the measure of true greatness. Souls able to remain so faithful and respectful, such as his was, to the Gospel and to the Holy Church, are made for the highest ascents, which grant glory down here with our contemporaries as well as with our posterity, to whom Marc Sangnier's example will remain as a teaching and encouragement. On the occasion of his passing, my spirit was much comforted in observing that the most representative voices of official France were unanimously agreed in wrapping Marc Sangnier, as a mantle of honor, with the Sermon on the Mount. No loftier homage and praise could be rendered to the memory of this distinguished Frenchman, of whom his contemporaries could appreciate clearness of a deeply Christian soul as well as noble sincerity of heart”<sup>84</sup>.**

Perhaps, monsignor Roncalli ignored that, to the Catholic Church, the **Sillon** was none other than a **“miserable affluent of the great movement of apostasy”** (Pius X).

It must not, therefore, be forgotten that John XXIII, on June 5, 1960, approved, with the institution of the **Secretariat**, that **“ecumenical Movement”** Pius XI had condemned. In fact, the **“ecumenical Movement”** came into being toward the close of the

past century, within the circle of the Protestant sects, out of concern for the continuous fragmentation of their religious world. It then flowed, with the adhesion of the **Orthodox**, into the ill-famed **Ecumenical Council of Churches (ECC)**, founded in Amsterdam in 1948 by 147 Christian “churches” (!!). However, the Catholic Church always prohibited any participation in it. **Three Decrees of the Holy Office** (5 June 1948, 4 July and 20 December 1949) placed the **“veto” upon anyone intending to participate without authorization of the Holy See.** The famous previous encyclical of Pius XI, *“Mortalium Animos”* (6 January 1928) had already condemned that **ecumenical Movement**, called **“pan-Christian.”**<sup>85</sup>

But John XXIII, in the Consistory of 14 December 1959, **ordained cardinal the Jesuit father Bea, “without whom John XXIII would probably not have got the Council that he wanted.”**<sup>86</sup> He would then change the **Commission for the Promotion of the Unity of the Christians** into a **Secretariat**, since – he would tell cardinal Bea – **“Commissions have their own tradition; let us call the new organization “Secretariat”, so you are not bound by any tradition; you are going to enjoy a higher freedom.”**<sup>87</sup>

And that is what punctually happened.

The ecumenical Movement promptly embarked on **“historical meetings”** with the representatives of the various religions. For example, on June 13, 1960, John XXIII received, secretly, **Jules Marx Isaac**, initiating a dialogue with Judaism. On December 2, he met the **Anglican Primate**, opening to Protestantism, and giving way to other such initiatives, and making it possible for non-Catholics to attend the Council as **“observers”**, or **“guests”**, with all the influence of their presence. In fact, **a to and fro of heretics punctually followed Fisher’s** visit, crowding the private study of the Pope.

Among these: on 12 June 1961, **Bernard Pawley**, canon of the cathedral of Ely (England), personal representative of the archbishop of Canterbury and of the archbishop of York; on 15 November 1961, **Dr. Arthur Lichtenberger**, president of the Episcopalian Church of the United States of America; on 20 December 1961, Dr. **Joseph Batist**, president of the US “National Baptist Convention”; on 28 March 1962, **the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, Presbyterian**; on 7 April 1962, Dr. **Mervyn Stockwood**, Anglican bishop of Southwark (England); on 27 April 1962, Professor **Edmund Schlink DD**, of the University of Heidelberg, Germany, representative of the local Council of the Evangelical Church; on 10 May 1962, **Dr. Arthur Morris**, Anglican bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich; on 17 May 1962, **the Metropolitan Damaskinos of Voplos**, Greece; on 20 June 1962, Dr. **Joost de Blank**, Anglican archbishop of Cape Town, South Africa; and, to follow, the representatives of the non-Christian religions; and again **the masons of the Judaic-Masonic lodge of the B’nai B’rith** (18 January 1960); then, on 30 July 1962, **Shizuka Matsubara**, superior of the Shintoist temple at Kyoto, Japan, with his family, and so on and so forth.

Now, all these meetings, more or less secret, triggered a sort of **ecumenical fever**, and made the star of Bea shine, but, above all, they buried Pius XI’s encyclical “*Mortalium Animos*”, drafted with a completely different view as opposed to that of the “**Secretariat for the Union of Christians**,” led by Bea, who by now triumphed in spreading the new ecumenical doctrine. While ecclesiology previously excluded the other separated Christians, now, with Pope John XXIII, even the non-Catholics are merged into the Church, as he clearly conveyed to the Preparatory Commission on November 13, 1960:

**“... To be a great point, to be kept firm by any baptized, that the Church always remains His (Christ’s) mystical Body, of whom He remains the Head, and Whom every one of us refers to, and to Whom we do belong”,**

cutting out Pius XII’s encyclical *“Mystici Corporis,”* by now reduced into a mere historical document of the year 1943.

But his **ecumenism**, at this juncture, was beyond denial. **Guido Gusso**, the personal attendant of the Patriarch of Venice, Roncalli, interviewed by Renato Allegri, declared:

**“(...) When I realized that the cardinal invited Protestants, Jews and Muslims, without distinction, to his table, I was astonished. He saw my astonishment and, smiling, explained to me that all men were children of God, independently of the religion they professed. All that mattered was to be honest and faithful to one’s own consciousness and, therefore, to one’s own faith (...). One day, as though to explain his conduct, he told me, ‘If I were born a Muslim, I would have surely made a good Muslim, faithful to my religion’.”<sup>88</sup>**

Here, too, monsignor Roncalli ignored the Apostle St. John: **“If any man come to you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house, nor say to him: God speed you.. For he that saith unto him: God speed you, communicateth with his wicked works.”** (2 John 1:10-11). Hence, one could say Roncalli professed religious indifferentism, which is heresy, and could cause simple souls to lose their faith.

To him, in fact, even a Muslim was agreeable to God, like a Christian, thus accepting the **anonymous Christianity of the Jesuit**



**Karl Rahner**, who maintains, **“even he that did not believe in Christ, would be ‘Christian’ all the same.”** In fact, at Venice’s City Hall, on the occasion of his first meeting with the City Council, Cardinal Roncalli said:

**“... I’m happy to find myself in the midst of active people, for only those working for a worthy cause are authentic Christians. The only way of being Christian is to be good. That is why I’m happy to be here, even though in your midst are some who call themselves non-Christians, and yet may be recognized as such on account of their good deeds.”<sup>89</sup>**

Pure theological nonsense! To Roncalli a Christian is he that does **good deeds**, even though he does not believe; and he is not a Christian that is not good, even though a baptized believer. Hence, according to Roncalli, Christianity is reduced into pure natural ethics; good deeds are equivalent to supernatural ones, and Faith becomes superfluous. And here you have his ecumenism.

Unfortunately, his **“Secretariat”** with Bea, after only two years of operations, produced as a fruit, among others, **a scheme contrary to the doctrine of the Church**, which it [Secretariat] put before the Council for approval. And that under the responsibility, before God and His Church, of Pope John XXIII. □

## WHO WAS, THEN, IN REALITY, POPE JOHN XXIII? □ □ □ □

One cannot ignore the **alleged initiation of monsignor Roncalli into the secret Masonic society of the Rose Cross**, initiation that would have taken place during his stay in Turkey. As regards such initiation, all we have is the written text of **Pier Carpi**<sup>90</sup>, a **mason**<sup>91</sup> also known for his biography of Cagliostro (Meb publishers) and for an inquiry on the Merchants of the occult (Armenia publishers). Author of those **“Prophecies of Pope John”** Pier Carpi maintains that, in 1935, while Apostolic Delegate in Turkey, Roncalli was initiated into a secret Society, which he abstains from naming, but whose initiation ceremony he describes (p. 53 sqq.), which appears of the Templarist Freemasonry rite, such as that studied by Le Forestier. During the ceremony, **Roncalli took the name of Joannes**, the same he would take as a Pontiff. The source used by Pier Carpi was an aged member of the Rosa Cross (p. 35). In his aforementioned book, he also reports about a session Roncalli attended, a few weeks following his initiation, at a temple of the Order.

There are **other more serious arguments** corroborating a real collusion between Roncalli and Freemasonry, as we will see.

The Grand Master of the Grand Orient of Italy, **Virgilio Gaito**, in two interviews given to the reporter of *L'Italia Settimanale* and to that of *Trenta Giorni*, the monthly of the *Comunione e Liberazione* association, to the question: **“Do you know if there are any priests in the lodges of the Grand Orient; the buzz has it that some cardinal had been a brother...”** he replied, **“Probably. I have no**

**information of this fact. They say John XXIII was initiated to Freemasonry when he was a Nuncio in Paris. That is what I was told. Besides, in his messages I caught many aspects that are in fact Masonic. I was pleased to hear him say one must place the accent upon man.”<sup>92</sup>**

And to the journalist Cubeddu, of *Trenta Giorni*, he [Grand Master Gaito] said, **“It seems Pope John XXIII was initiated in Paris, and participated in the works of the Workshops at Istanbul...”**

The Grand *Commendatore* of the Supreme Council of Mexican Freemasonry, **Carlos Vasquez Rangel**, also revealed **“Angelo Roncalli was supposedly initiated to Freemasonry in Paris.”<sup>93</sup>**

Now, these assertions of mason Grand Masters present us with the question of a **probable affiliation** of John XXIII to Freemasonry.

The freemason **Pier Carpi** agrees that John XXIII joined the **Rosa Cross** in 1935, at Istanbul. But it is in Paris – according to Gaito and Vasquez Rangel – that monsignor Roncalli would have been initiated to the secrets of the **Children of the Widow**. Here, we again recall his friendship with the socialist **Vincent Auriol** as well as with the radical **Edouard Herriot**, both members of Freemasonry.<sup>94</sup> I also recall his disappointment when they told him his above praised friend Minister of Education of the French Government, whom he considered **“very good,”** was a mason<sup>95</sup>.

One further indication of his Masonic affiliation comes from his friendship with the Baron **Yves Marie Antoine Marsaudon, of the Grand Lodge of France** and, since 1932, **Venerable Master of the 33d degree of the Republic Lodge.**<sup>96</sup> He [Marsaudon] himself confirms it in his three books.<sup>97</sup>

Wrote Marsaudon:

**“On the occasion of our numerous encounters... in the stillness of his study, we were able to have with the Nuncio more and more lively discussions even about our humble conceptions as regards the relationship between Church and Freemasonry... at last, we came to discuss the rapprochement between the different Christian Churches... We were able to touch upon very delicate issues regarding some Roman disciplines (which?) and even the dogma... and ‘those he perceived in the air’ (?) as, for example, on the Marian dogma of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin to Heaven. To Marsaudon’s query, ‘Your Excellency, what do you think of the voices about the promulgation of the new Marian dogma?’ Monsignor Roncalli replied, ‘What do we read in the Gospel?’ The Mother of Jesus is scarcely considered and not always well treated by Her Son. Keep in mind: ‘Who is my Mother or my Brothers?’ And He looked around in a circle at those who sat about him, and said, ‘Here are my Mother and my Brothers, for whoever does the will of God is My Brother and My Sister and Mother...’ and a harsh answer at the Marriage of Cana, ‘What have I to do with thee?’ [grossly inaccurate translation! Properly: What is that to me and to thee?] ... Then, She is the sorrowful Mother, but very human, at the foot of the Cross. Suddenly, but as widely expected in Rome, the dogma of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary was promulgated by Pius XII.<sup>98</sup> And he [Marsaudon] goes on to explain this sense of Roncalli’s, saying that he [Roncalli] had a ‘great caution (?) when confronted with any dogmatic innovation. He always had the others in mind, and the effect this or that innovation’ might have produced, on the separated Christians.”**

Hence, according to Marsaudon, monsignor Roncalli was opposed

to the definition of the dogma of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary for ecumenical reasons. Such interpretation is corroborated by an analogous episode. Having become Patriarch of Venice, monsignor Roncalli, with a letter of 1954, **in which he adduces the very same ecumenical reasons exposed against the Assumption**, refused to endorse a petition to institute **the holiday of Mary Regina Mundi**.<sup>99</sup>

However, the relationship between Marsaudon and Roncalli continued also in Venice and Rome, where the former used to be received **“with the utmost graciousness.”**<sup>100</sup> It must be noted that, as Nuncio in Paris, he [Roncalli] received him [Marsaudon] numerous times at the Nunciature, and, on various occasions, he called on his home at Bellevue, at Seine-et-Oise. When Marsaudon was appointed Minister of the Order of Malta, he manifested to the Nuncio his perplexity as to whether he should accept the function, on account of his Masonic affiliation; but **the Nuncio advised him to accept, while retaining his affiliation to Freemasonry**. At last, as a Pope, receiving him [Marsaudon] at Castel Gandolfo, **he encouraged him in his mending action between the Churches, as well as between Church and Freemasonry**.

Another of his friends, at the time of his Nunciature, was **Carl J. Burckardt**, a Masonic dignitary and Swiss diplomat, who wrote of Roncalli, **“He is a deist and a rationalist (...). He will change many things; after him, the Church will never be the same.”**<sup>101</sup>

Also mention must be made of the fact that Pius XII had placed the **Order of Malta** under investigation, appointing a Cardinalitial Commission with the task of informing on, or suppressing that Order of Malta, since the infiltration of Freemasonry in the Order posed very serious doubts as to its residual Catholicity.<sup>102</sup>

But Pope John XXIII, on June 24, 1961, feast of St. John Baptist, patron of the Order, received at Vatican the Knights of the Order, disclosing to them his **“Brief”** by which he suppressed the **Cardinalitial Commission of Pius XII**, and approved the new **constitutions of the Order**, authorizing it to elect again a **Grand Master**, which Pius XII had rigorously prohibited. Through that gesture, Pope John XXIII, reversing the decision of his predecessor, cleared the way to a fresh Masonic infiltration of the Order of Malta.

In any case, the approach of Roncalli toward Freemasonry was always one and the same. **He never did condemn Freemasonry.**<sup>103</sup>

**After the numerous Papal documents condemning and excommunicating masonry affiliates**, the last voice to rise against that infamous sect was that of **Pius XII**, on May 23, 1958, a few months prior to his passing. Then, no more condemnations were to be had, rather, there were first a host of conciliatory documents of the **Episcopal Conferences**, and, to follow, of the Holy See, culminating in the **lifting of the excommunication** (28 November 1983). And for the first time, under John XXIII, in the **Volney Lodge of Laval**, in France, the **Jesuit father Michel Riquet**, **“with the concurrence of the ecclesiastical authorities,”** held a conference, giving tidings of the **dialogue** by now in full swing between Church and Freemasonry.

**It was thus with John XXIII that the Catholic Church slammed her doors open to Freemasonry.** Declared the Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of France, **Dupey**, **“John XXIII and Vatican II gave a formidable impulse to the work of clarification and reciprocal disarmament between Church and Freemasonry.”** Wrote the writer **Léon de Poncins**: **“With the election of John XXIII... one had clearly the impression of a methodically organized international campaign.”**<sup>104</sup>

And the Grand Master of [Italian] Freemasonry, **Salvini**, declared, in 1970, **“John XXIII has recently published a document, which on this theme stands so close to our approach** (namely: not asking the brothers about their religion); in fact, *‘Mater et Magistra’* and *‘Pacem in Terris’* offer interesting starting points as to human rapprochement, even where ideological differences exist.”<sup>105</sup>

And writes **Alec Mellor**, **“The last phase had to be prepared through the Revision wanted by John XXIII and, subsequently, by Paul VI.”**<sup>106</sup>

Wrote **Roberto Fabiani**, **“It was John XXIII to break the ice with a measure that went completely unnoticed: he authorized the Protestants, converted to Catholicism and affiliated with Freemasonry, to retain their Masonic membership. From that moment, the contacts grew unchecked...”**<sup>107</sup>

The **Jesuit father José Antonio Ferrer Benimelli**, confirms the open-minded position of Roncalli in regard to the double membership.

In any case, not only did John XXIII not oppose Freemasonry, but, on the contrary, he favored it and espoused, in part, its principles, and supported the possibility of being at one time a Catholic and a freemason.

So it is hardly out of place to affirm that the current ecumenism is the legitimate heir of Freemasonry, whose aim is to unite, in fact, all religious confessions. It is the Masonic ecumenism of today.

Is this **revolution pursued by John XXIII**, not the revolution of the **freedom of conscience? His tolerance toward Freemasonry,**

which pursues the abolition of all dogmas, had to lead, necessarily, also to the abolition of the dogmatic Church of Rome. How is one to read, in fact, that first clamorous gesture of John XXIII, in the matter of ecumenism, which in fact concerned a mason, namely, **the Anglican Primate Geoffrey F. Fischer, archbishop of Canterbury**, received at Vatican on December 2, 1960? **Fischer was initiated to the “Old Reptonian” Lodge n. 3725 of the Grand Lodge of England, in 1916. In 1939, by this Grand Mother Lodge of the world, he held the position of Grand Chaplain, which, in the Latin-Catholic Freemasonry lodges goes by the name of “Grand Orator.”**<sup>108</sup>

Fisher, in fact, initiated the **Rome-London dialogue**. The encounter of **“two Popes and two Mason Chiefs”** (John XXIII and Fisher; Paul VI and Athenagoras<sup>109</sup>) is, to be sure, quite astounding, since the initiation of the Anglican Hierarchies to Freemasonry is a common occurrence.<sup>110</sup>

\*\*\*

At this point, one has the duty to ask: **what kind of relationship did Pope John XXIII entertain with the Jews**, these being the advocates of all kinds of attacks on the Catholic Church in order to demolish her? Here is a quick synthesis of that relationship. **At Algiers, in March of 1950, monsignor Roncalli “again spoke of the Jews as of the sons of the promise (Romans IX, 8)...”** as the basis for a serious theological dialogue and the consideration of the people of Israel **“in the light of Abraham, the great Patriarch of all believers,”**<sup>111</sup> certainly overlooking that, today, the Jews are no longer believers, but incredulous, and that they are no longer the **“heirs of the Promise.”**

To Roncalli, on the contrary, they would be part of the Mystical



Body of Christ (even though they do not believe), that is, of the Church. In fact, at Paris, as he watched a film showing the horrors of Buchenwald and Auschwitz, he cried, “**Why? The Mystical Body of Christ!**” in which it was recalled that the Mystical Body of Christ coincided (only) with the Catholic Church.

Therefore, it is important to recall that the Jew **Jules Marx Isaac** received from John XXIII the promise of a revision of the Christian doctrine as regards the relationship between Church and Judaism. In fact, on January 18, 1960, at the **World Jewish Congress**, and on October 17 the same year, at the American **United Jewish Appeal Association**,<sup>112</sup> John XXIII held two Allocutions. It so happens that, in the second one, doctrinal errors can be observed. On March 17, 1962, as his car advanced on the Lungotevere [traffic lanes on either bank of the Tiber], he had his car pull over by the Synagogue, whence emerged a group of Jews. The Pope blessed them. No previous Pope had ever done that.<sup>113</sup>

Another opening gesture toward Judaism, made by John XXIII, was in the liturgical reform, through the suppression, in the Baptismal rite, of formulas referring to Judaic incredulity and Jewish superstition.<sup>114</sup>

Another of John XXIII’s initiatives was that of writing a **secret letter** to the Superior of the convent of Wilten, by which he **suppressed the cult of the Blessed Andrea da Rinn**, in Tyrol, martyred in 1462 by the Jews. And yet the Church had expressed her pronouncement through a **Bull of beatification, and Pope Benedict XIV had approved his cult, in 1755, with the Bull “*Beatus Andrea.*”**

Another of John XXIII’s interventions, in a similar case, regarding

the profanation on the part of the Jews of **consecrated Hosts**, was that of suppressing, in 1960, the veneration of the frescos in the city of Deggendorf, in Bavaria, as well as suppressing the connected pilgrimage.<sup>115</sup>

Again: on October 17, 1960, receiving in audience **130 American Jews, together with the rabbi Herbert Friedman**, he said:

**“... There is surely a difference between those who acknowledge but the Old Testament and those who add to it the New one, in which they see their law and their supreme guide. Such difference, however, does not abolish the fraternity of our common root. We are all children of one and the same Father. We come from the Father and to the Father we must return.”**<sup>116</sup>

Extremely grave words, these of John XXIII!

First, because the difference between Christians and Jews would consist in the fact that the Jews add the Old and New Testament, ignoring, however, that **the Jews add to the Old Testament the Talmud as well, even giving it a preference over the Law of God.**<sup>117</sup>

Second, because the **difference** at issue, according to John XXIII, would not cancel **“the radical unity of origin, (we come from the Father) of destiny and of insertion onto the same divine level (and to the Father we must return).”** And that would be standing for all religions, as he himself stated addressing the Roman Curia on the meeting of Assisi, on December 22, 1960. Now, if it is true, in an improper sense, that we are all children of the same celestial Father, inasmuch as we are creatures of God, but in a proper sense, inasmuch as everyone would achieve the adoption to children of God, it is not

true at all, since the faith in God the Father cannot subsist without the faith in God the Son. **“If God were your Father - Jesus said - you would indeed love Me, for from God I proceeded and came.... You are of your father, the devil, and the desires of your father you will do... He that is of God heareth the words of God. Therefore you hear them not, because you are not of God.”**<sup>118</sup>

Moreover, how is one to accept John XXIII’s statement about the Jews, when he too had to know that **the Jews do not recognize Christ and reject His divinity?** But Roncalli’s mind, by now, had for decades been prey to that false ecumenism, even with Judaism, which would then develop into *“Nostra Aetate”* of Vatican II!

**Here are two Homilies of John XXIII, which stand as a token of his universal brotherhood: at the outbreak of World War II, in Istanbul’s Cathedral, he prayed thus:**

**“We look up to You, O Lord, on behalf of all those living under this heaven, of any race, as we are all brothers, without distinction of religion, law, customs, traditions or class.”**

At Pentecost of 1944, shortly before his departure from Istanbul, in his farewell homily, embracing with his gaze the variegated and composite assembly packing the Cathedral, Roncalli emphasized that

**“We can all find the best reasons to underscore the differences of race, culture, religion or conduct. The Catholics, in particular, are keen to distinguish themselves from the ‘others’: Orthodox brothers, Protestants, Jews, Muslims, believers and non-believers of other religions”... “Dear brothers and sons, I have to tell you that, in light of the Gospel and of the Catholic principle, that is false logic. Jesus came to knock down these barriers; He died in**

**order to proclaim universal brotherhood; the central point of His teaching is charity, that is, the love which binds all men to Him as the first of all brothers, and which binds Him, with us, to the Father.”<sup>119</sup>**

Now, **“to knock down the barriers”**, yes, but Christ had done it by destroying and condemning the other religions and converting their followers to His own. Roncalli, on the contrary, speaks of confessional barriers that must be overcome by love, but without Faith, for he speaks of different **“faiths”** (and of **“non faiths”**), which would unite all men to Christ, first brother, and to the Father. It is the arguing of an ignoramus in Catholic theology, which teaches that in order to be adoptive children of the Father and brothers of Jesus Christ, one needs both **Faith and sanctifying Grace**. Now, a **“non-believer”** possesses neither of the two. And that applies also to the members of other religions, except for instances of unshakable ignorance, which, being known exclusively to God, cannot be presumed.

John XXIII, therefore, speaks like a **“visionary,”** an **“utopist”** describing not the Catholic brotherhood, but a Masonic brotherhood that makes no **distinctions between religions**.

Hence, John XXIII was also responsible for the entire action of his close collaborator, cardinal Bea, toward a **radical change on the part of the Church** with regard to Judaism, since it was he that decided to break away from the ecclesiastical Tradition. It will suffice to recall that it was he who decided that it should be the **Secretariat** to put forward the schemes on **religious freedom** (*Dignitatis Humanae*) as also that regarding the Jews (*Nostra Aetate*), certainly inspired and requested by the Masonic lodges **B’nai B’rith**.

I wish to recall, therefore, that cardinal Bea, in his report on the *De Judaeis* scheme, mentions “**The explicit charge entrusted to the Secretariat by the Pope; namely, that of addressing the many prejudices (?!), even amongst the Catholics, regarding the Jews, especially the fact of considering them ‘deicide’ and ‘accursed by God’.**” Cardinal Bea could thus work around every opposition to his scheme, re-launched, then, by John XXIII himself, in a sheet bearing no Vatican heading, of 13 December 1963, written entirely of his own hand, in which he said,

**“Having read with much attention this report of cardinal Bea’s, we are perfectly agreed as to its gravity as well as to the responsibility of Our consideration. The ‘*Sanguis ejus super nos et super filios nostros*’ (His Blood be upon us and upon our children) does not exempt any believer from addressing the problem and the apostolate for the salvation of all the children of Abraham, as well as any other living on the earth. *Te, ergo, quesumus Tuis famulis subveni, quos praetioso sanguine redemisti!* – (We therefore beseech Thee come to the aid of Thy servants whom Thou hast redeemed by Thy precious Blood.)**

**“*Joannes XXIII*”<sup>120</sup>.**

With that simple writing, Pope John XXIII posed again the issue of the agenda of the Council, turning himself, for a second time, into the spiritual father of the future conciliar document “*Nostra Aetate*.”<sup>121</sup>

Even the last six months of John XXIII’s government were, however, filled with the intense activity of cardinal Bea, fully supported and encouraged by the Pope. After the **VII Agape Meeting**, for example, he [John XXIII] sent out a letter of praise, signed by the Secretary of State,<sup>122</sup> even though everyone had

perceived the contradiction between cardinal Bea and the Church. After the **VIII Agape Meeting**, he did even worse. A few months later, at last, he **fully espoused** Bea's heterodox position on **religious freedom** in his encyclical "*Pacem in Terris.*"

\*\*\*

We can now say, here, in short, that the **responsibility of John XXIII** appears clear throughout his Pontificate, during which:

- 1) **He changed the Catholic Liturgy in an ecumenist sense**, suppressing every doctrine sustained by almost the entirety of the conciliar fathers;
- 2) **He collaborated with, and favored the anti-Christian Associations connected to Freemasonry;**
- 3) **He approved in full the doctrine contained in cardinal Bea's scheme**, much more explicit than that approved, subsequently, in the Conciliar Declaration "*Nostra Aetate.*" John XXIII, having died, did not promulgate it (Paul VI did), but approved it nonetheless.

John XXIII had, perhaps, forgotten that in the year 52-53, **St. Paul** – a converted Pharisee – had written his co-religionists that the Jews were they “Who both killed the Lord Jesus, and the prophets, and have persecuted us, and please not God, and are adversaries to all men; prohibiting us to speak to the Gentiles, that they may be saved, to fill up their sins always: for the wrath of God is come upon them to the end.” (1 Thessalonians 2:15,16).

And he must have forgotten what St. John the Evangelist wrote, “... **that say they are Jews and are not, but are the synagogue of**

**Satan**” (Apocalypse 2, 9). And, perhaps, he even ignored what the Jews said about Jesus, referring to Him as a **“fellow,”** or with the epithet of **“Balaam”** (the ancient soothsayer of Numbers, 22 and subsequent), and with **“mad,” “bastard,”** and more serious insults.<sup>123</sup>

He certainly refused to recognize that divergence between Church and Synagogue lies not in personal, but in doctrinal and dogmatic issues; neither did he recognize that Judaism would never accept that the Church is the **new Israel**, which renders the previous one [Israel] supplanted, hence the Church would never come to accept the refusal of the **divinity of Jesus Christ** on the part of Israel.

Why, then, did John XXIII do that which [Italy’s] **Chief Rabbi Toaff** could declare, and that is, **“With the Church, there is currently an understanding such as has never been achieved in the past, and the ‘merit’ goes to John XXIII?”**<sup>124</sup>

And how is it that the Jewish historian **Léon Poliakov**, could write, **“in 1958, a new era was ushered in under the pontificate of his successor, John XXIII?”**<sup>125</sup>

And how is it, the Jewish **Paul Giniewski** could say, **“...The ideas and acts of the new supreme pontiff, John XXIII (1881-1963), rendered possible the hope of a revolution in the relations between the Church and the Jews?”**<sup>126</sup>

It is a fact that, since his election to the pontificate, Roncalli had opened to the Jews, so that his election was welcomed in Israel, which exulted, then, when John XXIII omitted and had omitted, in the well-known prayer for the Jews, the adjective **“perfidious”** (in Medieval Latin, simply signifying **“non-believing”**). And that represented a **“go-ahead” to all the powerful Jewish Associations.**

And not only did he make that suppression in favor of the Jews, but **John XXIII similarly suppressed the words Leo XIII, in his encyclical of 25 May 1889, “Annum Sacrum”,** consecrating humanity to the Holy Heart of Jesus, had himself composed. It was a most grave act for a Vicar of Jesus Christ, an act that grew even graver when Pius XI, in 1925, with the encyclical “*Quas Primas,*” instituted the liturgical holiday of Christ the King, ordering that the act of consecration of his predecessor be publicly recited, every year, on Christ the King day. It must be noted, in addition, that in that Leonine oration, one prayed for Muslims and Jews as follows:

**“Be Thou King of all those who are still involved in the darkness of idolatry or of Islamism, and refuse not to draw them into the light and kingdom of God. Turn Thine eyes of mercy towards the children of that race, once Thy chosen people: of old they called down upon themselves the Blood of the Savior; may it now descend upon them a laver of redemption and life.”**

John XXIII’s gesture, therefore, defies all imagination, and **certainly cannot favor his beatification.**

As he would not be beatifiable when one considered, in addition, his tepid love for the Virgin Mary, **even though one were to excuse him by saying that his attitude was such as not to compromise his ecumenical cause.**

I have already mentioned his perplexities for the proclamation of the **dogma of the Assumption** (1950), but he also held the view that one should not exceed in the devotion to the Virgin Mary, hence, a view opposed to the “*de Maria numquam satis*”. For that reason, he refused to sign a petition for the institution of the **Regalitis Mariae**, writing, **“I strongly beg you to excuse my silence which**



signals, hitherto, the remarkable vacillation of my spirit, in the fear of a grave prejudice as to the apostolic efficacy employed to bringing unity back into the Holy Catholic Church in the world. Dying Jesus said to John, ‘Behold, your mother’. That is sufficient to faith and to liturgy (...). The rest can be, and for a great part is, edifying, and, to some devout and pious souls, moving, but to many, many others, although inclined toward the Catholic Church, vexing, and, as they say nowadays, counterproductive (...). In the meantime, I am content to say: **Hail, Holy Queen, *mater misericordiae*.**”<sup>127</sup>

His **Mariology**, therefore, had some limits, such as the somber Mariology of Vatican II would later feature.

It must also be recalled that **John XXIII, already a Patriarch, had spoken against the proclamation of the liturgical holiday of the Regality of the Virgin Mary**<sup>128</sup>; and his **opposition**, always related to the dogmatic definition of the Spiritual Maternity of Mary, **he had reiterated as a Pope.**

\*\*\*

It is clear, therefore, that many of the positions of the “*Papa Buono*” did not befit a “**Good Pope.**” And that because the **real goodness** of him who stands at the helm must always be regulated by the virtue of prudence, which must in turn be sustained by the virtue of fortitude toward the necessary concatenation of all virtues. Or that **goodness** becomes **vice**, when elevated to a system of government. Is it not true that too lenient a doctor makes the sore gangrenous? “**He that compromises with error is alien to love in its wholeness and sovereign force**”... and “**charity always cries out for light, and light does not suffer the tiniest shadow of compromise.**”<sup>129</sup>

**Pope John XXIII, therefore, is not a Pope to be canonized.** It will suffice to reflect upon the disintegration devastating the Church, today, in the matter of Faith, traditions, and discipline; the disintegration on account of the dreadful crisis in the vocations, of the numerous defections of priests and devout; the disintegration on account of the constant advance of the communist and atheist “*mens*”... all evils deriving – for a great part – from the lack of firmness and insight of the Pontifical government of John XXIII.

The **green light** of the Holy See to a process of beatification directly following his death, was thus a rash decision, and the recent acceleration in order to hasten his beatification, even setting out a date, is equally scarcely comprehensible.

And that is the reason that brought me to draft this flash-sketch upon Roncalli: as a young modernist cleric, as a pioneer of modernist ecumenism, as a comrade of leftist politicians, and as inextricably tied to Freemasonry.

\*\*\*

May I emphasize the unspeakable, irreconcilable proposal of John XXIII together with Pius IX for simultaneous beatification, for it is a gesture adding irony to insult. John XXIII sank Pius IX’s **Syllabus**, certainly an instrument of necessary and morally binding defense against the pressing attack of **modernism**, synthesis of all heresies. Any association between these two men constitutes a blatant insult to the apostolic work of Pius IX.

It was certainly not **liberal** to continue to permit the appointment of

bishops by the civil power. It was certainly not **pastoral** to continue to accept the liberal demand to replace the Christian religion with a **deism** that defined Christian **Revelation** as old junk, nor was it pastoral to continue to accept the **Civil Constitution of the Clergy**, by which the priest is considered a State official. It was certainly out of the question that a Pontiff could accept the massacre of bishops and priests during the French Revolution, filled with liberal ideas. It was certainly out of the question that a Pope would continue to put up with the closure of convents and monasteries at the whim of the liberal State. It was out of the question that the Church accept an **Illuminist laity** that churned out an endless host of progressive political theories, lacking in sociality and bare of any Christian idea.

**Pius IX's condemnations**, therefore, struck a society that had nothing of liberal and constitutional; **they condemned a political and modernistic totalitarianism** that must not – as happened – come to the barbarism of communism.

Pope John XXIII, instead, was the **anti-prophet** of Pius IX, both by wiping out the **Syllabus** with Vatican II, and by opening his arms to **communism, atheist and criminal**, still in murderous pursuit of the sparse remnants of the Church of Jesus Christ.

One can but be astounded in observing two concepts of sanctity which Rome maintains today: the **Catholic** sanctity of Pius IX, and the **ecumenical** sanctity of John XXIII; the **sanctity** of a Pope who bravely struggled against the enemies of the Church, and the **alleged sanctity** of the other Pope, who undermined the defense of the rights of Christ-God; who caused the faithful to dismantle their defense against the modern evils and failed to defend them against those very evils: **freemasonry, communism, sects, and false religions**.

**Hence to be willing to beatify Pope John XXIII together with Pius IX is a clear example of modernist action, for it is a willing to bless the Pope of the conciliar revision along with the Pope who defined the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception of Mary and of Pontifical Infallibility, and who, with the Syllabus and the encyclical “*Quanta Cura*”, laid bare the pathogenic germs of the modern and contemporary social maladies directed to killing the Faith.**

**This is why, Your Excellency, I intend to manifest to the Holy See my will and my plea that Pope John XXIII not receive the honor of beatification for any legitimated reason.**