

# A TUXEDO FOR FRANKENSTEIN

*by Most Reverend Donald J. Sanborn*

On July 2, 2010, Msgr. Guido Pozzo, the secretary of the Pontifical Commission “Ecclesia Dei,” gave a conference to the European priests of the Fraternity of St. Peter at Wigratzbad, the location of their seminary in Germany. The Fraternity of St. Peter is the group which was founded in 1988 consisting of former members of the Society of Saint Pius X who were dissatisfied by Archbishop Lefebvre’s decision to consecrate four bishops without the permission of John Paul II. At the same time, John Paul set up a commission called “Ecclesia Dei,” which was meant to oversee the newly formed Fraternity, as well as anything which pertained to the Indult Mass, i.e., the 1962 traditional Mass then permitted by the Vatican under certain circumstances. Msgr. Pozzo is the current Secretary of this commission, which means its virtual head.

In this speech, Msgr. Pozzo attempts to give a completely orthodox interpretation of the Second Vatican Council’s Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, more commonly known as *Lumen Gentium*. This constitution is notable for its presentation of a new ecclesiology. *Ecclesiology* is the term which the Church uses for the doctrine regarding its own nature and attributes. At the Vatican Council of 1870, there was a wonderful document prepared, which certainly would have been

approved, that treated of all the dogmatic issues concerning the Church. Unfortunately historical events prevented the approval of this document. France declared war on Germany, having been deliberately provoked into it by the freemasonic and fiercely anti-Catholic German Chancellor Bismarck. The result was that France, in order to fight the Germans, had to quickly recall its troops which it had stationed in Rome. This absence of the French military in Rome, which had protected the Pope and his States since 1848 from the forces of the equally freemasonic and fiercely anti-Catholic Garibaldi, virtually opened the gates to the filthy hordes of the Italian revolutionaries. On Sept. 20, 1870, Rome, the papal capital and sacred city since the time of Constantine, fell to the philistine mobs. Owing to these events, the council had to be interrupted, and the very

important work of defining certain dogmas concerning the Church was left undone. Pope Leo XIII, perceiving this gap left by the unfinished council, issued in 1896 an encyclical entitled *Satis Cognitum*, in which he spelled out all of the traditional ecclesiology. Pope Pius XII also spoke about the nature of the Church in his 1943 encyclical entitled *Mystici Corporis*. Encyclicals as a rule, however, do not define anything but merely explain. They are, after all, only letters to all the bishops of the



world. While the pope can solemnly define dogmas in such encyclicals, he usually does not. Definitions are normally found in more authoritative documents known as papal bulls, which are issued usually for the precise purpose of teaching solemnly or of condemning solemnly by means of the anathema.

Because of this lacuna left by the 1870 council, there had been ever since an idea among the high clergy that the 1870 Vatican Council should be reconvened in order to finish its work. However, because of the Modernist problem the popes, and particularly Pius XII,



*Monsignor Guido Pozzo*

were reluctant to call another council, so much did they fear the influence of Modernist-leaning bishops. Already this spirit of nascent Modernism had been evident in the 1870 council. The Second Vatican Council, therefore, convoked by the Modernist John XXIII for the very purpose of canonizing ecumenism, felt the obligation to finish the work of the 1870 Vatican Council by making a dogmatic constitution concerning the nature of the Church. What this constitution produced, however, was a new ecclesiology, that is, a novel and unorthodox teaching concerning the nature of the Church of Christ.

This new ecclesiology had been floating around in Modernist circles for many decades. One must always remember that the soul of Vatican II is ecumenism, and that every error, every reform, every heresy, every liturgical abomination takes its origin from ecumenism.

The problem for the ecumenists long before Vatican II was: how do you have ecumenism with other

religions, when the Catholic Church teaches that it alone is the one, true Church outside of which there is no salvation? Such a doctrine instantly turns into trash every ecclesiastical entity which is outside of the walls of the Catholic Church, rightly and logically so. Somehow the Modernists had to find a solution to this problem, something which would make the non-Catholic sects feel good about themselves, that they too had some place in the Church of Christ.

The first notable attempt was made by Dom Beauduin<sup>1</sup>, an ecumenical maniac. He was the one who, at the death of Pius XII, said to some intimates: “If they elect Roncalli, everything will be safe: he is capable of calling a council and of consecrating ecumenism...” He was also the one who suggested that the liturgy should be made to be a vehicle of ecumenism, thereby paving the way for Paul VI’s Novus Ordo. Dom Beauduin was the first, writing in the 1930’s, to extend the Mystical Body of Christ beyond the limits of the Roman Catholic Church.

The new ecclesiology was growing so intensely among the avant-garde theologians, who were really just Modernists, that it prompted Pius XII to issue a condemnation of it in the encyclical *Humani Generis* of 1950: “Some say they are not bound by the doctrine, explained in Our Encyclical Letter of a few years ago, and based on the sources of revelation, which teaches that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same thing. Some reduce to a meaningless formula the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to gain eternal salvation.”

Pius XII’s efforts were too little too late. Since 1914, after the death of Saint Pius X, the Modernists had been permitted to run amock, and many of them were made prelates by Benedict XV, Pius XI, and Pius XII. Although these popes were not Modernists themselves, nevertheless by their negligence in suppressing the Modernist heresy they fanned the flames of it, the most pernicious of any enemy which has assailed the Church. For example, Roncalli, although a known Modernist, was made a bishop by Pius XI in 1925, and was consecrated in the beautiful church of San Carlo al Corso in Rome. Ironically, this church was recently in the news (*The Wall Street Journal*, November 5<sup>th</sup>, 2010) for the fact that a priest has transformed its basement into a night club for young people.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dom Lambert Beauduin (1873–1960) was a Belgian monk who founded the monastery now known as Chevetogne Abbey in 1925.

## The Differences between the New and Traditional Ecclesiology

It is not my purpose here to give a lengthy explanation of either the new or the traditional ecclesiology. I have written at length on these subjects in two articles, one entitled *Communion*, written in 1992, and the other entitled *A Critical Analysis of Dominus Jesus*, written in 2000. Both of these articles were written on the occasion of major documents produced by Ratzinger on the very notion of ecclesiology. Both of Ratzinger's documents must be taken as authentic interpretations of the Second Vatican Council, coming as they do from the very authors and promulgators of that council.<sup>2</sup> Ample quotations from both Modernist and Catholic sources can be found in these articles to justify what I will say here.

**The traditional ecclesiology.** The traditional definition of the Church, found to be substantially the same in all the traditional books and in the documents of the Church, is this: *A group of the baptized faithful, who are united by the profession of the same faith, by participation in the same sacraments, under the vicar of Christ on earth, the Roman Pontiff.* What is easily seen in the definition is that four things are necessary in order to be a member of the Church: (1) a valid baptism; (2) profession of the same faith; (3) participation in the same sacraments; (4) submission to the Roman Pontiff. The Church of Christ, therefore, is a single and unique hierarchical organization in which all are validly baptized, profess the same dogmas, participate in the same seven sacraments, and are submitted to the pope. Because all of these things pertain to the definition, they pertain to the very essence of the Church. Therefore the removal of even one of these elements would destroy the essence. Consequently, if even one of these elements is missing, membership in the Church, even imperfect, is not possible.<sup>3</sup> Hence Jews, Moslems, and pagans are excluded from the Church of Christ through lack of valid baptism. Heretics are excluded because they neither profess the same dogmas nor participate in the same sacraments. Schismatics, such as the so-called Greek Orthodox, are excluded because they are not submitted to the Roman Pontiff. The traditional ecclesiology teaches that there is an absolute

identity and equality among these three things: the Church of Christ, the Roman Catholic Church, and the Mystical Body of Christ.

Church of Christ = Roman Catholic Church = Mystical Body of Christ.

Furthermore, the Church has always taught that *outside the Church there is no salvation*. This means that anyone who deliberately and with sufficient knowledge places himself outside the Roman Catholic Church will necessarily go to hell. It also means that anyone to whom the truth of the Catholic Faith has been sufficiently manifested, but at the same time fails to join the Roman Catholic Church, will also necessarily go to hell. It does not mean that those who are outside of the Roman Catholic Church through invincible ignorance will necessarily go to hell; if they are damned, it will be for another reason, but not for the reason of failing to join the Catholic Church.

Needless to say, there is absolutely no room for ecumenism in this system. If your church or religion fails in one of the four essential elements of being the Church of Christ, which is exclusively the Roman Catholic Church, which is, in turn, exclusively the Mystical Body of Christ, then you are nothing. In fact, you are worse than nothing: you are a false sect which leads people to hell. The only way in which your adherents can avoid hell is by a desire, through the influence of divine grace, to adhere to the true Church. But this desire to adhere to the true Church involves necessarily a desire to abjure and condemn the false sect to which one adheres.

In summary, the traditional ecclesiology is very clear: The Church of Christ is one monolithic and hierarchical Church, the Roman Catholic Church, founded by Jesus Christ, of which the Roman Pontiff is the head. It, and it alone, is the Mystical Body of Christ.

**The new ecclesiology.** I here repeat what I said earlier, that the new ecclesiology is a creature of ecumenism. Vatican II set out to give some sort of participation in the Church of Christ to non-Catholic sects.

We will let Ratzinger tell us what the new ecclesiology is: **“Therefore there exists a single Church of Christ, which subsists in the Catholic Church,**

---

<sup>2</sup> Both of my articles can be found on the [traditionalmass.org](http://traditionalmass.org) website.

<sup>3</sup> I am not excluding by this statement the possibility of belonging to the Church by desire in a person who is invincibly ignorant of the true Church. I am speaking only of external and visible membership.

governed by the Successor of Peter and by the Bishops in communion with him. The Churches which, while not existing in perfect communion with the Catholic Church, remain united with her by means of the closest bonds, that is, by apostolic succession and a valid Eucharist, are true particular Churches. Therefore, the Church of Christ is present and operative also in these Churches, even though they lack full communion with the Catholic Church, since they do not accept the Catholic doctrine of the Primacy, which, according to the will of God, the Bishop of Rome objectively has and exercises over the entire Church.”<sup>4</sup>

The new ecclesiology distinguishes the Church of Christ from the Catholic Church. For Ratzinger clearly states that the Church of Christ is present and operative in those churches which are separated from Rome, i.e., the Eastern schismatics. Now obviously the Catholic Church is not present and operative in them, since they do not accept the Roman primacy. Consequently the Church of Christ has a greater extension than the Catholic Church. Therefore they cannot be one and the same thing.

This difference between the Church of Christ and the Catholic Church is further accentuated by the term “*subsists in*.” If one thing subsists in something else, it means that the first thing cannot subsist on its own. Let me give an example. A color cannot subsist on its own, but must subsist *in* something else. We cannot purchase a jar of “blue.” The color blue must be *in* something else in order to achieve a real existence. It cannot exist on its own. So we must purchase blue paint or blue ink. Subsistence is that perfection by which something exists on its own, and not *in* something else. So sovereign nations have national subsistence. They exist on their own and are independent of other countries. But their provinces or counties do not have a national subsistence. A province or county, by its very nature, subsists *in* the sovereign nation, on which it depends for existence.

So if we apply “subsists in” to the Church of Christ, we see that by itself it cannot achieve existence, but must receive its existence from some other entity, and is dependent on that entity for its existence. That other entity, in this case, is the Catholic Church, that visible hierarchical organization which is subject to the pope.

Listen to Vatican II: “This Church [the Church of Christ] constituted and organized in the world as a society, subsists in the Catholic Church, which is governed by the successor of Peter and by the Bishops in communion with him, although many elements of sanctification and of truth are found outside of its visible structure. These elements, as gifts belonging to the Church of Christ, are forces impelling toward catholic unity.”

The conclusion is plain for all to see: The Church of Christ does not subsist on its own as an organized society, but must find its subsistence, its ability to exist, in something else. That something else is the Catholic Church. Ratzinger includes in the Church of Christ the Eastern schismatics, who are also heretics. He refers to them as particular churches, which, in the traditional ecclesiology referred only to those dioceses which were subject to the Roman Pontiff. To include in the Church of Christ a diocese or particular church which is not subjected to the Roman Pontiff, is to say that the Church of Christ exists outside of the Roman Catholic Church. In other words, it finds existence in non-Catholic sects as well, although “imperfectly” as they would say. The only possible logical conclusion is that the Church of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are two different entities. They do not have the same extension or even the same nature, since even those churches which reject the Roman primacy are part of the Church of Christ.

Ratzinger underscores this difference between the Church of Christ and the Catholic Church by saying that the universal Church, the Church of Christ, is the sum total of all the particular churches. “**The universal Church is therefore the body of the Churches.**”<sup>5</sup> Now the Catholic Church does not include in its fold the Eastern schismatics. Even the Modernists admit this. But the Eastern schismatic churches are “particular churches,” according to Ratzinger. We therefore see the universal Church or Church of Christ emerging: a conglomerate of many diverse churches with different hierarchical structures, different beliefs, and not subject to the Roman Pontiff.

Pope Pius XII was clear in *Mystici Corporis* (1943) that the Church of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church and the Mystical Body were one and the same thing. “**If We would define and describe this true**

---

<sup>4</sup> From the document *Dominus Jesus* (2000) by Ratzinger.

<sup>5</sup> Document of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith entitled *Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion*, 1992.

Church of Jesus Christ — which is the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church — We shall find nothing more noble, more sublime, or more divine than the expression ‘the Mystical Body of Christ.’ ” In this one sentence we find all of the traditional ecclesiology which I explained above.

Cardinal Willebrands, on May 5th and 8th of 1987, held some conferences in which he affirmed that the “subsistit” [*subsists in*] supersedes and corrects the “est” [*is*] of Pius XII (cf. *Documentation Catholique*, January 3, 1988). Fr. Yves Congar, a peritus (theological expert) at Vatican II and one of its principal contributors, said this:

The problem remains if *Lumen Gentium* strictly and exclusively identifies the Mystical Body of Christ with the Catholic Church, as did Pius XII in *Mystici Corporis*. Can we not call it into doubt when we observe that not only is the attribute “Roman” missing, but also that one avoids saying that only Catholics are members of the Mystical Body. Thus they are telling us (in *Gaudium et Spes*) that the Church of Christ and of the Apostles *subsistit in* [*subsists in*], is found in the Catholic Church. There is consequently no strict identification, that is exclusive, between the Church of Christ and the “Roman” Church. Vatican II admits, fundamentally, that non-Catholic christians are members of the Mystical Body and not merely ordered to it. [emphasis added]<sup>6</sup>

What emerges in the new ecclesiology is a broad Church of Christ which includes many disparate religions. Fr. Anthony Cekada, never wanting for wit, has termed this creature of Vatican II *Frankenchurch*, for it is a composite of many unrelated and separated churches, sewn together to produce what appears to be a single religion or church. Just as Dr. Frankenstein found many body parts and sewed them together to form a single humanoid monster, so Ratzinger sews together all of these non-Catholic sects into an ecclesiastical monster, the *Frankenchurch*. The analogy is perfect. It is also funny.

It should be funny, for what Vatican II and Ratzinger propose to us Catholics for belief is absurd and ridiculous. It is not I alone who say it. Pope Pius XI said it in *Mortalium Animos* (1928) which condemned ecumenism: “It is absurd and ridiculous to say that the Mystical Body can be formed out of separated and disjunct members.”



*Fathers Joseph Ratzinger (later Benedict XVI) and Yves Congar, both of them periti at the Council. (Ratzinger is this time sporting a Roman collar, and is not in his usual suit and tie)*

#### Frankenstein in a Tux

Msgr. Pozzo is one of many Vatican II conservatives (“neo-cons”) who are trying to prop up the failing Council. On both the liturgical and doctrinal fronts, Vatican II has been found wanting. Young clergy have noticed that there is a disturbing difference between pre-Vatican II and post-Vatican II. Already the establishment of the Fraternity of Saint Peter and similar groups has addressed the liturgical issue. The *Motu Proprio* Mass has also been a milestone in the admission that there is trouble in the Vatican II liturgical paradise. But lately there has been more attention paid to the doctrinal problems posed by Vatican II, perhaps because of the discussions between the Modernists and the Society of Saint Pius X.

There is a type of bunker mentality among the geriatric creators of Vatican II. Hitler, in the early months of 1945, retired to a bunker in Berlin where he would be isolated from American and British bombs as well as Soviet artillery. In that shelter he lived in a peaceful world away from the deafening and nerve-racking explosions. He told his generals to send non-existent divisions out to meet the Russians. Few had the courage to tell him that these divisions did not exist anymore. The ever faithful Goebbels published the propaganda throughout the then mostly conquered Germany that Berlin remained German. So as the

<sup>6</sup> *Le Concile de Vatican II*, (Paris: Beauchesne) p. 160.

Catholic Church has practically fallen apart, when one compares it to the day of Pius XII's death in October of 1958, the designers of the New Church cannot believe their eyes as they behold the breathtaking destruction. It was supposed to have been all different. Vatican II would be a great success, they thought.

Evidence of this mentality can be seen in Ratzinger's speech on December 22, 2005: **"The question arises: why has the reception of the Council, in many parts of the Church, unfolded up to now with so much difficulty? Indeed, everything depends on the correct interpretation of the Council or — as we would say nowadays — on its correct hermeneutic, the correct key for reading and interpreting it."** Ratzinger then contrasts two interpretations, one of continuity with the past and the other of rupture with the past.

Consequently there has arisen a propaganda machine to promulgate the hermeneutic of continuity, and to condemn the hermeneutic of rupture. Ratzinger is intelligent enough to understand that the mere perception of rupture with the past means the historical death of Vatican II.

Msgr. Pozzo, in his defense of Vatican II ecclesiology, is fulfilling this role of storm trooper of the continuity propaganda. The fact that he found it necessary to show continuity between Vatican II and the traditional ecclesiology is indicative, I think, that a significant number have raised the question.

Msgr. Pozzo tries to put a tuxedo on Frankenchurch. In other words, he has to make the heretical ecclesiastical creature of Vatican II look Catholic.

I have cited Ratzinger and other authoritative persons in my presentation of the new ecclesiology in order to point out that the heretical interpretation is not something which is the invention of radicals, as Msgr. Pozzo would have us believe. One could add to the many texts which I have presented the heretical practices of the Novus Ordo prelates, especially of John Paul II, which bespeak a heretical interpretation of Vatican II. Furthermore, the 1983 Code of Canon Law contains a heretical notion of the Church, distinguishing as it does between "Christ's faithful" [*christifideles*] and "Christ's Catholic faithful" [*christifideles catholici*], as if one could be attached to Christ without being attached to the Catholic Church.

Msgr. Pozzo attempts to solve the problem of *subsists in* by this reassurance: **"The one Church of Christ, therefore, is realized, given existence, and established**

**in the Catholic Church. There is no other Church of Christ alongside the Catholic Church."**

His words are self-contradictory. The only formula which satisfies the demands of the Faith is: The Church of Christ *is* the Catholic Church. But the Monsignor's words still manifest that the Church of Christ must beg its existence from the Catholic Church, which means that they are two different entities. His claim that there is no other Church of Christ alongside the Catholic Church contradicts what Ratzinger has said in his official documents. For according to Ratzinger there is definitely an entity which has greater extension than the Catholic Church, which Vatican II and Ratzinger call the Church of Christ.

The Monsignor then defends the "full" and "partial" communion nonsense of Vatican II. In summary, this theory — this heresy — of partial communion asserts that there is an ecclesiastical bond among all of the "communities" of the baptized, and a full communion among those baptized who are incorporated visibly into the Catholic organization.

This theory originated among the protestants who after a few centuries found themselves to be an alphabet soup of sects divided over doctrine. For many years they have been trying to put their false religions together into a conglomerate, in which each sect is in partial communion with the others, inasmuch as they all have some things in common. Nowhere did this distinction between full and partial communion exist in Catholic doctrine or theology before Vatican II. For communion of any type, even partial, gives an ecclesiastical dignity to these non-Catholic sects, these illegitimate groups which have no existence as churches or religions in the eyes of God. They are merely bands of heretics or schismatics. Vatican II would like to place the garment of ecclesiastical dignity upon them because, as the Modernists say, they have "ecclesial elements." This means that they are in possession of goods stolen from the Roman Catholic Church which they use sacrilegiously, e.g., Baptism or the Holy Eucharist.

Msgr. Pozzo, however, repeats the familiar theme of the new ecclesiology: **"The relation between the Catholic Church and non-Catholic Christian Churches and ecclesial communities is not that between all and nothing, but between the fullness of communion and partial communion."** Contrast this to Pope Pius IX: "None [of these religious societies differing among themselves and separated from the Catholic Church], not even taken as a whole, constitutes in any

way and is not that one, Catholic Church founded and made by Our Lord and which He wished to create. Further, one cannot say in any way that these societies are either members or parts of that same Church, because they are visibly separated from Catholic unity.”<sup>7</sup> Listen to Pope Pius XI: “It is to depart from divine truth to imagine a Church which one can neither see nor touch, which would be nothing more than spiritual in which numerous Christian communities would be united by an invisible bond, even though they are divided in faith.”<sup>8</sup> So how can the Monsignor expect us to take him seriously when he is telling us that this is “hermeneutic of continuity?”

Msgr. Pozzo even defends the Vatican II teaching that the non-Catholic sects are means of salvation, an overtly heretical doctrine. **“They [the other Christian Churches and communities] are, therefore, ‘instruments of salvation’ (UR 3) by virtue of what they have in common with the Catholic Church and their faithful, following that which is common to both, can attain salvation; but in regards to whatever in them is estranged from and opposed to the Catholic Church they are not an instrument of salvation...”**

In order that something be a means to something else (and Vatican II uses the word *means* and not *instrument*, as the Monsignor has chosen), it is required that it have everything necessary to lead to the end. For example, a jet aircraft is a means to fly from New York to Paris because it has everything necessary to make the trip. If you noticed that the aircraft were missing its engines or a tail, would you board the plane because it had some “elements” of an aircraft? Of course not. So the fact that non-Catholic sects possess illegitimately some sacraments and truths which could be used for someone’s sanctification does not mean that *as sects* or *organized*

*societies* they are means of salvation. For a means of salvation requires everything necessary for salvation. The Monsignor admits that they are not an instrument of salvation in what is opposed to the Catholic Church. The only conclusion is that in those things which are opposed to the Catholic Church they are a means of damnation, for whatever is opposed to the Catholic Faith leads to hell.

Let an example illustrate. If someone puts on your dinner plate a combination of healthy food and food laced with cyanide, what will happen at the end of the meal? Will the healthy food overcome the effects of the cyanide? Or will you keel over in death as a result of the

poisoning? What makes the dinner a healthful meal, and not the cause of your death, is not the fact that only some healthful elements are present, but that all of the elements are free from poison. Just as a cyanided potato will cause your death, so will the heretical doctrines of a false sect cause your damnation. The only way they would not is if you adhere to them out of invincible ignorance.

Msgr. Pozzo, therefore, would have us believe as “hermeneutic of continuity” that non-Catholic sects are at one and the same time a means of salvation and a means of damnation. Would the Monsignor be so kind as to cite for us a pre-Vatican II pope or theologian who says that a non-Catholic sect is a means of salvation? Indeed, if this is continuity, then such quotations should be in abundance.

Msgr. Pozzo goes on in his lengthy speech defending the new ecclesiology, assigning an imperfect ecclesiastical quality or dignity to non-Catholic sects. Such a doctrine, however, is in diametrical opposition to the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church. The central issue which divides the new ecclesiology from the teaching of the Catholic Church is whether there is to be found in any sect outside the Roman Catholic Church a legitimate “ecclesiality” or “churchness,” that is, a participation,



<sup>7</sup> Apostolic Letter *Jam vos omnes*, September 13, 1868.

<sup>8</sup> *Mortalium Animos*.

however imperfect, in the one, true Church of Christ, which is the Roman Catholic Church and the Mystical Body of Christ. If you concede to a non-Catholic sect any such participation, you divide the Church of Christ and the Mystical Body from the Roman Catholic Church. In so doing, you fall under the condemnation of many Roman Pontiffs.

Msgr. Pozzo finishes his speech by assigning the causes, in his opinion, for the “hermeneutic of rupture” or false interpretation of Vatican II. The first, he says, “*is the renunciation of the anathema, that is the clear distinction between orthodoxy and heresy.*” Yet, how can this be the cause of false interpretation, since it is the Vatican II “popes” themselves who have renounced the anathema? Hans Küng, the public denier of nearly every Catholic dogma, is a priest in good standing, and was even invited to lunch at Castel Gandolfo with his old Vatican II buddy, Benedict XVI.

The second cause he assigns is “*the translation of Catholic thought into the categories of modernity.*” But who has done this more than John Paul II, the personalist and phenomenologist, and Ratzinger, who spurns scholastic theology? Can anyone understand the encyclicals of Ratzinger? Does anyone bother to read them? Did anyone ever read or understand the seemingly endless encyclicals of John Paul II? They are gibberish, written in a language which is meant for an intellectual elite who are also schooled in the same obscure and roundabout way of speaking. Modernists learned to do this early on; they were able to let their heresies pass more easily by stepping out of the traditional theological language. So here again, Msgr. Pozzo’s criticism goes straight back to the Vatican II popes.

The third reason he gives for the false interpretation of Vatican II is “*the interpretation of aggiornamento desired by Vatican II.*” He tries to defend John XXIII’s term (*aggiornamento*) as merely a desire to find a new pastoral way to bring the world to a better understanding of the holy gospel. But such a rosy view of John XXIII’s intentions does not stand up to the facts. Roncalli (John XXIII) was a man who even from his seminary days wanted to see a Modernist transformation of the Church. His mentor in the seminary was none other than the arch-Modernist Buonaiuti, who was later condemned as a heretic by Pope Saint Pius X, and who died impenitent in the 1940’s. The reading of the biographies of John XXIII, even those written by his most devoted admirers, is to read the life of a man who wanted to demolish the traditional Faith and to replace it with the Modernism to

which he adhered from his very youth. Msgr. Pozzo seems to not know the history of the program to transform the Church into a religion acceptable to the liberal, rationalist, and free-thinking modern world, a program that dates back to the eighteenth century and beyond, and of which *aggiornamento* is clearly representative.

### **Beware of Frankenstein in a Tuxedo**

Vatican II is not something that can be fixed. After nearly fifty years of this council, there is devastation everywhere, and the younger clergy are naturally looking at Vatican II with a critical eye. As a result, there is an attempt to repair it, to put a tuxedo on Frankenstein, and to say that nothing has changed since 1958.

It is significant that Msgr. Pozzo, whose purpose it was to show that indeed Vatican II changed nothing substantial in the Church’s ecclesiology, did not cite a single pre-Vatican II pope or a single pre-Vatican II theologian in support of what he was saying. For he cannot. Not one (except the avant-garde Modernist theologians) will uphold any ecclesiastical dignity in non-Catholic sects; in fact they will say the precise opposite: that to assert such a thing is to pervert the very nature of the Catholic Church.

In summary, the speech to the Fraternity of Saint Peter boils down to an act of propaganda. *Berlin bleibt deutsch*. Berlin remains German, as Goebbels said to console those suffering under occupation by foreign troops. So Msgr. Pozzo consoles the Fraternity of Saint Peter with a barrage of gratuitous statements, statements lacking substance or foundation, lacking scholarly support, statements which merely augment the volume of the loudspeaker proclaiming the same old defense of the increasingly assailed Vatican II: *nothing has changed*.

It is to dress up Frankenchurch in a tuxedo. But the ugly head of this universal Superchurch, consisting of body parts from all the sects in the world, still sticks out from above the bow tie. Do not be fooled by the tuxedo.

My main purpose in writing this article is not to respond to the Frankenchurch heresy, which I have done in a detailed manner elsewhere. It is to alert our people that in the coming years there will be an ever increasing attempt to whitewash Vatican II, to cleanse it of its iniquity, to call its heresy orthodoxy. But we who have been given the grace to resist the Vatican II onslaught will fail miserably in what God expects of us if we accept Frankenstein in his new suit of clothes.