

ONEPETERFIVE PRESENTS:

A REVOLUTION IN TIARA & COPE

*A Brief History Of The
Freemasonic Infiltration Of The Catholic Church*

WRITTEN BY BRIAN MILES

A REVOLUTION IN TIARA AND COPE

*A Brief History of the Freemasonic Infiltration of the Catholic
Church*

By Brian Miles

Published by OnePeterFive

©2019, OnePeterFive, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

FOREWORD

When Brian Miles first pitched me the idea of doing an in-depth essay on Freemasonic infiltration of the Catholic Church back in 2015, I couldn't wait to read it. At the time, Freemasonry in the Church wasn't discussed nearly as much nor as openly as it is today, just a few years later. Nor was its overt compatibility with the papacy of Pope Francis [so troublingly clear](#).

Brian's piece, which evolved into a three-part series, was an eye-opener for me. Having never studied the issue before, it was the first time I had heard of the Permanent Instruction of the Alta Vendita, or learned how openly hostile the plans of the Italian Masons known as the Carbonari were toward the Church and the papacy.

It seems that today, Catholics everywhere are talking about their plot.

"Our ultimate end," the authors of the Instruction wrote, "is that of Voltaire and of the French Revolution – the final destruction of Catholicism, and even the Christian idea..." And they knew that their plan would require them to play a very long game. So long, in fact, that they would not live to see its accomplishment. "The task that we are going to undertake," they continued, "is not the work of a day, or of a month, or of a year; it may last several years, perhaps a century; but in our ranks the soldier dies and the struggle goes on."

Those words were first published in 1859. And the patience those "soldiers" of the anti-Christian forces of Freemasonry has manifestly paid off. It has had profound consequences for the Church and her faithful, and the infiltration has manifested within the hierarchy in ways that the popes of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, despite their many warnings, could scarcely have imagined.

What Brian has written here is an important work – quite possibly one of the most accessible introductions to the Freemasonic attack on the Catholic Church from within that has ever been published, and incredibly valuable for how much it packs into such a short text – and I'm proud to share it with you once again as a single piece in this new format.

I should note that since this is an eBook, we decided to keep the original links in the text, of which there are many, rather than converting them all

into footnotes. We've gone through and removed or replaced every broken link we've found, but since we do not maintain the websites they link to, it is possible that you'll find that others may break at some point in the future. It should be noted that while the links provide great supplemental evidence to Brian's thought-provoking exposition, I'm happy to say that his work stands alone, and the text retains its force even if you never click a single one.

I hope you find what follows as valuable as I have.

Steve Skojec
Publisher & Executive Director
OnePeterFive
July 17, 2019

PART I

In order that the Christian people may more certainly derive an abundance of graces from the sacred liturgy, holy Mother Church desires to undertake with great care a general restoration of the liturgy itself. For the liturgy is made up of immutable elements divinely instituted, and of elements subject to change. These not only may but ought to be changed with the passage of time if they have suffered from the intrusion of anything out of harmony with the inner nature of the liturgy or have become unsuited to it... The rites should be distinguished by a noble simplicity; they should be short, clear, and unencumbered by useless repetitions... In this restoration, both texts and rites should be drawn up so that they express more clearly the holy things which they signify... The rite of the Mass is to be revised in such a way that the intrinsic nature and purpose of its several parts, as also the connection between them, may be more clearly manifested, and that devout and active participation by the faithful may be more easily achieved.

Sacrosanctum Concilium (21, 36, 50)

While a measured degree of self-criticism can be a fruitful undertaking, in the passage quoted above, which comes to us from the Second Vatican Council's Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, it is difficult to ignore the tacit indictment of the very Tradition the Council was presumably called to uphold. Whatever merits the Council Fathers were willing to concede in the liturgy of their forebears, their stated goals nevertheless betray a marked conviction that prevailing rite of Holy Mass had become somehow unfit to provide for the needs of the faithful. From even a cursory reading of the text, one can readily discern that what we now know as the Tridentine or Traditional Latin Mass was evidently thought to suffer from a number of rather considerable defects:

1. Its facility for the transmission of graces was noted to be less certain than it might have been.
2. Its so-called mutable elements were said to have suffered from intrusions – *useless encumbering repetitions* – unsuited and out of harmony with the interior nature of the Mass.

3. Its expression of holy things, and the mysteries they signify, were found to be less clear than they might have been.
4. Its manifestation of the intrinsic nature and purpose of the Mass was thought to be more obscure than it might have been.
5. Its fostering of the devout and active participation of the faithful was considered to be less effective than it might have been.

In other words, the Mass itself – in both its efficacy and expressions – was perceived to be somehow inhibiting the very ends it was meant to achieve. If such an appraisal of the Church’s supreme act of worship sounds a bit strange and self-loathing, what remains stranger still is the fact that the text provides us with little insight into the grounds for these condemnations. Instead, it simply asserts that the Mass needed to change in order to fulfill a threefold purpose; namely, “to adapt more suitably to the needs of our time...to foster whatever can promote union among all who believe in Christ...[and] to strengthen whatever can help to call the whole of mankind into the household of the Church.”

What are we to make of this? Even if we give these quintessentially ambiguous statements the most generous reading possible (i.e. that their principal aim is to subdue modernity on route to converting both Protestants and unbelievers), they nevertheless continue to beg a crucial question; that is, why was the Mass of the Ages, which had subdued every epoch and converted every culture it had encountered, suddenly found wanting when measured against the challenges of the modern world? What was so unique about the conflicts of the mid-20th century that the Church – just as the fighting was growing fiercest – felt compelled to lay down her most faithful and effective arms, and instead take up some ill-conceived attempt at battlefield diplomacy?

In the face of how utterly, completely, categorically, and catastrophically wrong the Council Fathers have proven in their optimism about the renewal that would follow the conciliar changes, it is no sufficient accounting to simply cite the naïveté of certain misguided prelates. Were there some who fit that profile? Absolutely. Were there others too weak to resist the changes? Without question. And were there others still who carried the Council far beyond its mandate? It's undeniable.

But to stop there simply strains credulity beyond breaking. In short, no institution of divine pedigree, and with such ancient and enduring Tradition, errs that badly, *that quickly*, through mere frailty and false

optimism. Would that it were otherwise, but when [the warnings](#) – which [predicted the consequences](#) in prophetic detail – were pronounced well in advance - there remains an ominous and unpleasant possibility that we cannot overlook.

Imagine for a moment that for some within the Church the original impulse to alter the Mass arose, not from a recognition of its latent deficiencies, but rather from a sober assessment of its strengths; that for some, all the flowery and inflated talk about liturgical aggiornamento was only so much window dressing for some darker revolutionary design. Suppose that the Church's sleepless adversary – having bitterly recollected some countless centuries of defeat – began to perceive that, however shrewd his plans may be, they would only ever end in failure so long as the Church's most potent source of power remained *uncorrupted and intact*. Thus, in addition to redeploying his hordes of fracturing Protestants, fanatical Muslims, sexual libertines, and sneering atheists, suppose the enemy sought, above all else, to compromise the liturgical bulwark that had never previously failed to repel these same heretical assaults.

In other words, suppose the Devil understood (apparently far better than many of those called to oppose him) that so long as the Mass of the Ages remained in place – and thus the Church's indefectible lifeline to the Most High – whatever attacks his forces might muster, her standard would nevertheless remain high. Conversely, then, suppose he saw that if he could somehow manage to change that standard – and substitute her flag for a foreign banner – he might at last succeed in bringing the Bride of Christ to heel. Catholic scholar John Zmirak [offers this perspective from history](#):

In every revolution, the first thing you change is the flag. Once that has been replaced, in the public mind all bets are off – which is why the Commies and Nazis filled every available space with their Satanic banners. Imagine, for a moment, that a newly elected president replaced the Stars and Stripes with the Confederate battle flag. Or that he replaced our 50 stars with the flag of Mexico. Let's say he got away with doing this, and wasn't carried off by the Secret Service to an "undisclosed location." What would that signify for his administration? If people accepted the change, what else would they be likely to accept?

With respect to the Church, if the last 45 years are any indication, to say nothing of [recent papal scandals](#), it would appear that the answer is just about anything and everything. And why not? If we can effectively change

our flag from [this](#) to [this](#), and then proceed to permit all [manner](#) of [nonsense](#) without [censure](#), is there really any mystery regarding whether the Devil has accomplished his coup? But lest I be accused of peddling speculation devoid of any substance, what the remainder of this series of essays will attempt to prove is that there are a number of compelling reasons to conclude that for some within the Church the conciliar changes to her liturgy did indeed have more to do with revolution than renewal.

I also assert that it is possible to launch such a critical analysis from a place of orthodoxy; faithful sons of the Church, in full communion with Rome (as I am), need not fear to tread where we are going. Instead, we must consider objectively the manifold evidence for the following conclusions:

1. That there is in fact an organized cabal – expressly acknowledged by popes Gregory XVI, Pius IX, and Leo XIII – whose stated purpose was and is to infiltrate and destroy the Roman Catholic Church.
2. That a member of this cabal, a priest who was identified as such and excommunicated accordingly, went on to predict – some 90 years in advance – that an Ecumenical Council would subvert the liturgical and sacramental life of the Church.
3. That the exact character of this cabal, and a description of its 20th century assault on the sacraments, was identified *by name* in an approved apparition of Our Lady *over a century before* it ever came into being.
4. That the timing of the conciliar changes in the Church's liturgy conforms credibly with Pope Leo XIII's alleged vision of Satan's 20th century ascendancy.
5. That the historical events which led to these changes effectively invited the destructive influence of the infiltrators.

To this end, with respect to our first two points, it must be noted that these ideas were first developed at length in a short book by [John Vennari](#). Along these same lines, in his [biography](#) of Pius IX, the vice-president of the Italian National Research Council, [Roberto de Mattei](#), provides evidence of Gregory XVI's rising fears regarding the existence a secret revolutionary network arrayed against and within the Church.

On 20 May 1846, sensing that death was approaching and filled with foreboding, Pope Gregory XVI summoned the French historian Jacques Crétineau-Joly to the Quirinale Palace. Crétineau-Joly was already known

for his histories of the resistance in the Vendée to the French Revolution, and of the Jesuits. The Pope, who in the 15 years of his difficult reign had shown himself to be an implacable enemy of liberalism and of sects, wanted to confide to the French historian as his 'last testament' the task of writing a history of secret societies and their consequences. For this purpose, the Pope gave him a series of exceptional documents, including the Instructions in the correspondences from the Alta Vendita, whose networks constituted the most significant penetration of the forces of the revolution in Europe.

Foremost among these exceptional documents was a text known as the *Permanent Instruction on the Alta Vendita*, which Crétineau-Joly later incorporated – at the further [direction of Pius IX](#) – into his 1859 work entitled, *L'Église romaine en face de la Révolution (The Church in the Presence of the Revolution)*; more on this work and Crétineau-Joly are available [here](#)). From there, the *Instruction* subsequently appeared in an [1885 book](#) by Msgr. George F. Dillon (beginning on page 65), resoundingly endorsed as follows in a preface penned by Pope Leo XIII:

Beloved Son, Health and Apostolic Benediction. The presentation which you have recently made to Us...is your proof of your fidelity... You desired, as is evident by your writings, to describe chiefly those things which, in the last century and in our own, have been done by these perverse combinations of men whom a common hatred of virtue and truth binds together in an impious league against God and His Christ. On which account the very gravity itself of your subject tacitly exhorts Us that whenever any time should be given to Us from Our cares, that time We should willingly devote to the reading of your volume. For the noble zeal which aroused you to write of the atrocious war by which the religion of Christ is assailed, gives Us reason to hope that in the discharge of the ministry of the word you will assiduously labour to cause the faithful deeply to abhor those criminal societies condemned by Us and by Our predecessors, and understanding their most mischievous evil nature, not permit themselves to be ensnared by their fraudulent arts.

Thus, with a threefold papal approbation, the *Instruction* is not a text that can be dismissively consigned to the realm of conspiracy theory. To the contrary, it is a document that raised the hackles of men not only charged with defending the Faith, but also wise enough to understand when her enemies were on the march.

Concerning the identity of these enemies, Msgr. Dillon explains that they were an elite sect of Italian Freemasonry, which constituted “the supreme government of all the secret societies of the world”. Known as the Alta Vendita, its members comprised an organization with aspirations of worldwide domination. Doctrinally committed to both naturalism and materialism, the Alta Vendita understood explicitly that their advance could only proceed at the expense of their global ideological counterpart; namely, the institution of the Roman Catholic Church. To this end, the *Instruction* – as first intercepted by Gregory XVI – unequivocally sets forth the marching orders of the Alta Vendita:

Our final end is that of Voltaire and the French Revolution, the destruction forever of Catholicism and even of the Christian idea.

Having thus established its *raison d'être*, the *Instruction* quickly moves from broad strokes to detailed strategy. Recognizing that Catholicism has historically “seen the most implacable, the most terrible adversaries, and...often had the malignant pleasure of throwing holy water on the tombs of the most enraged”, the *Instruction* wisely discourages any *overt* assault on the Faith. Moreover, even as it acknowledges with envy the unparalleled influence of the papacy, it nevertheless concedes the futility of trying to bring the Roman Pontiff *formally* into its ranks.

Instead, the *Instruction* endeavors to undermine both the Church and her papacy by means of patient infiltration and longsuffering interior compromise. Intent on corrupting the youth in particular, the Alta Vendita envision a day when the Church, having become so imbued with the precepts of Freemasonry, will quite unconsciously find herself led by a pope who espouses secular humanism as if it were Sacred Tradition. The authors of the *Instruction* describe their ambitions thusly:

The Pope, whoever he may be, will never come to the secret societies. It is for the secret societies to come to the Church... The work we have undertaken is not the work of a day, nor of a month, nor of a year. It may last many years, a century perhaps, but in our ranks the soldier dies and the fight continues...

Now then, in order to secure to us a Pope in the manner required, it is necessary to fashion for that Pope a generation worthy of the reign of which we dream. Leave on one side old age and middle life, go to the youth, and, if possible, even to the infancy. Never speak in their presence a word

of impiety or impurity. *Maxima debetur puero reverentia*. Never forget these words of the poet for they will preserve you from licenses which it is absolutely essential to guard against for the good of the cause.

In order to reap profit at the home of each family, in order to give yourself the right of asylum at the domestic hearth, you ought to present yourself with all the appearance of a man grave and moral. Once your reputation is established in the colleges...and in the seminaries – once you shall have captivated the confidence of professors and students, act so that those who are engaged in the ecclesiastic state should love to seek your conversation...then little by little you will bring your disciples to the degree of cooking desired.

When upon all the points of ecclesiastical state at once, this daily work shall have spread our ideas as light, then you will appreciate the wisdom of the counsel in which we take the initiative... That reputation will open the way for our doctrines to pass to the bosoms of the young clergy, and go even to the depths of convents. In a few years the young clergy will have, by force of events, invaded all the functions. They will govern, administer, and judge. They will form the council of the Sovereign. They will be called upon to choose the Pontiff who will reign; and that Pontiff, like the greater part of his contemporaries, will be necessarily imbued with the...humanitarian principles which we are about to put into circulation... Let the clergy march under your banner in the belief always that they march under the banner of the Apostolic Keys.

You wish to cause the last vestige of tyranny and of oppression to disappear? Lay your nets like Simon Barjona. Lay them in the depths of sacristies, seminaries, and convents, rather than in the depth of the sea... You will bring yourselves as friends around the Apostolic Chair. You will have fished up a Revolution in Tiara and Cope, marching with Cross and banner – a Revolution which needs only to be spurred on a little to put the four corners of the world on fire. Let each act of your life tend then to discover the Philosopher's Stone. The alchemists of the middle ages lost their time and the gold of their dupes in the quest of this dreams. That of the secret societies will be accomplished for the most simple of reasons, because it is based on the passions of man. Let us not be discouraged then by a check, a reverse, or a defeat. Let us prepare our arms in the silence of our lodges, dress our batteries, flatter all passions most evil and most generous, and all lead us to think that our plans will succeed one day above even our most improbable calculations.

No, this is not an excerpt from *The Screwtape Letters*, though it may well have served as Lewis's source material. Unfortunately, this is the *actual* voice of the enemy; and as much as we might wish to dismiss it all as mere fairytale and fiction, there remains, not only that nagging complication of three papal endorsements, but also the manifestly obvious fact that the Church and the world have seemingly lived this *Instruction* to the letter. From top to bottom the aims of humanism have supplanted the Church's missionary enterprise, a fact which brings into sharp relief why the [Magisterium of today](#) sounds like a consumptive kitten when read alongside the lion [she once was](#). Those who have ears let them hear.

With that said, the careful reader, not entirely bewitched by the preceding machinations, may wonder why this essay, which attempts to identify the Traditional Latin Mass as the target of a diabolical plot, would quote from the text – however nefarious – which says nothing whatsoever about the Church's liturgy. Simply put: one can hardly imagine such a sea-change in Catholic teaching without a concomitant revolution in Catholic praxis; it's certainly no great mystery [among the enemies of the Church](#) that the two go hand-in-hand.

To this end, while the *Instruction* does not explicitly finger the liturgy in its designs, those who carried out its orders certainly did. In the next section, I'll explore the liturgical facet of this agenda more deeply, along with Our Lady's warning (and Pope Leo's vision) that just such an infiltration would threaten the Church.

PART II

In search of the foot soldiers of the *Alta Vendita*, we arrive at our second point and the work of His Excellency [Rudolph Graber](#), the late Bishop of Regensburg. Appointed to his See in 1962 by St. John XXIII, Bishop Graber would later serve as a Council Father, and in 1977 acted as the principal consecrator in Joseph Ratzinger's elevation to the episcopacy. A prolific theologian, whose works were widely disseminated throughout the world, we turn today to the English edition of his 1974 volume, *Athanasius and the Church of Our Time*.

In the fifth chapter of this text we meet Fr. Paul Roca (1830-1893). Ordained in 1858 in the Diocese of Perpignan, France, he was made an honorary canon in 1869. From there, he taught and traveled extensively abroad until he eventually ran afoul of Rome on account of his penchant of distributing occult propaganda among the youth. A known [author of Freemasonic literature](#), Roca was ultimately excommunicated for his heretical teaching, but he regrettably never recanted.

Instead, he continued promoting the doctrine of the Alta Vendita, speaking about “a new, enlightened Church influenced by the socialism of Jesus and the Apostles”; and for Roca this meant a Church that “might not be able to retain anything of Scholastic doctrine and the original form of the former Church”; on the contrary, just before the turn of the 20th century, Roca predicted the following:

[T]he divine cult in the form directed by the liturgy, ceremonial, ritual and regulations of the Roman Church will shortly undergo a transformation at an Ecumenical Council, which will restore it to the veritable simplicity of the golden age of the Apostles in accordance with the dictates of conscience and modern civilization.

Restoration? Simplicity? Apostolic Renaissance? Adaptation to modern times? Dictates of conscience? Has an Ecumenical Council ever taken up [such themes](#), and in the context of the [liturgy](#) no less? Even in hindsight, one could hardly concoct a more precise litany of the ideas that animated Vatican II. Thus, if St. John XXIII announced the Council to a [stunned silence](#), we can safely assume – at least for those prelates of Roca's ilk – that this silence had more to do with satisfaction than shock; but what should not be shocking to anyone who calls himself Catholic is the idea that Freemasonry should ever gain such influence in the Church.

Which leads us to our third point, and the approved apparitions of [Our Lady of Good Success](#). Beginning in the late 1500's, a Spanish Conceptionist nun, Mother Mariana de Jesus Torres, began receiving visitations from the Mother of God at her convent in Quito, Ecuador. Complete with the commissioning of a miraculous statue, added to a multitude of prophecies which have since come to pass, the Blessed Virgin spoke particularly about the pernicious activities of Masonic sects that would erupt in the 19th and 20th centuries; what is of special importance for our purposes is the fact that Freemasonry was not even founded until 1717 in London, England. That we should find such an exact descriptor – over a century in advance and on the opposite side of the world – is by itself a testament to the prophetic nature of these startling revelations:

Thus, I make it known to you that from the end of the 19th century and from shortly after the middle of the 20th century...the passions will erupt and there will be a total corruption of morals, for Satan will reign almost completely through the Masonic sects. They will focus principally on the children in order to sustain this general corruption. Woe to the children of these times! It will be difficult to receive the Sacrament of Baptism and also the Sacrament of Confirmation. They will receive the Sacrament of Confession only if they remain in Catholic schools, for the Devil will make a great effort to destroy it through persons in position of authority. The same thing will happen with the Sacrament of Holy Communion. Alas! How deeply I grieve to manifest to you the many enormous sacrileges – both public as well as secret – that will occur from profanation of the Holy Eucharist... My Most Holy Son will see Himself cast upon the ground and trampled upon by filthy feet... Often, during this epoch the enemies of Jesus Christ, instigated by the Devil, will steal consecrated Hosts from the churches so that they might profane the Eucharistic Species... The Sacrament of Extreme Unction will be little valued. Many people will die without receiving it... As for the Sacrament of Matrimony, which symbolizes the union of Christ with His Church, it will be attacked and deeply profaned. Freemasonry, which will then be in power, will enact iniquitous laws with the aim of doing away with this sacrament, making it easy for everyone to live in sin and encouraging the procreation of illegitimate children born without the blessing of the Church... Added to this will be the effects of secular education, which will be one reason for the death of priestly and religious vocations. The Sacrament of Holy Orders will be ridiculed... The Devil will try to persecute the ministers of the Lord in every possible way; he will labor with cruel and subtle astuteness to deviate them from the spirit of their vocation and will corrupt many of them. These depraved priests, who will scandalize the Christian people,

will make the hatred of bad Catholics and the enemies of the Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church fall upon all priests... Unhappy times will come wherein those who should fearlessly defend the rights of the Church will instead, blinded despite the light, give their hand to the Church's enemies and do their bidding. But when [evil] seems triumphant and when authority abuses its power, committing all manner of injustice and oppressing the weak, their ruin shall be near. They will fall and crash to the ground.

That's all seven sacraments (in case you weren't counting) and all – according to Our Lady's prophecy – wasting away under the withering influence of the Devil reigning in the Church through Masonic sects. It reads like a narrative description of our times, and here we have explicit references to a mode of liturgical life which lends itself to the Holy Eucharist being trampled underfoot. Considering the manner in which Mass was celebrated in the 1600's, who could imagine such a thing without also imagining some corresponding degradation in the character of the liturgy? And note also the parallels with the *Instruction*: targeting the youth, infiltrating schools, and corrupting morals. If the Masons laid out their strategy for destruction, the Blessed Virgin described its rotten fruit in morbid detail. Is it any wonder that Pope Leo XIII had this to say about Freemasonry in his 1884 encyclical *Humanum Genus*?

The race of man, after its miserable fall from God, the Creator and the Giver of heavenly gifts, "through the envy of the devil," separated into two diverse and opposite parts, of which the one steadfastly contends for truth and virtue, the other of those things which are contrary to virtue and to truth. The one is the kingdom of God on earth, namely, the true Church of Jesus Christ... The other is the kingdom of Satan... At every period of time each has been in conflict with the other, with a variety and multiplicity of weapons and of warfare, although not always with equal ardour and assault. At this period, however, the partisans of evil seems to be combining together, and to be struggling with united vehemence, led on or assisted by that strongly organized and widespread association called the Freemasons... They are planning the destruction of holy Church...with the set purpose of utterly despoiling the nations of Christendom, if it were possible, of the blessings obtained for us through Jesus Christ our Saviour.

Relentless in his condemnation the Holy Pontiff excoriates Freemasonry for its perpetration of all manner of public crimes. Among these (which ought to sound familiar to those of us now suffering through them) he includes the propagation of lewd materials and unbounded sexual license

“by which virtue may be lulled to sleep” (20); the promotion of relativism, religious indifferentism, and the dissolubility of marriage (21); the co-opting of education and the replacement of religious instructors with laymen (21); the elimination of God from governance, and the erosion of Natural Law and hierarchical social structures in exchange for a materialistic and hyper-egalitarian majority rule (22); and ultimately, the very destruction of religion and the Church founded by Jesus Christ (24). The Holy Father continues:

In this insane and wicked endeavor we may almost see the implacable hatred and spirit of revenge with which Satan himself is inflamed against Jesus Christ. So also the studious endeavor of the Freemasons to destroy the chief foundation of justice and honesty, and to cooperate with those who would wish, as if they were animals, to do what they please, tends only to the ignominious and disgraceful ruin of the human race.

In the face of such flagrant, far-reaching, and disastrous assaults the Holy Father understood quite keenly the need to mount a strong resistance; as such, he sets forth the following remedial program “for the extirpation of this foul plague which is creeping through the veins of the body politic.” First and foremost he counseled exposure, exhorting his readers to “tear away the mask of Freemasonry, and to let it be seen as it really is” (31). This was to be achieved by primarily through preaching and publication, but also by the promotion of virtuous organizations such as Catholic schools (36) religious guilds for workmen (35), and Third Order lay associations (34).

Yet above and beyond all these efforts the pope called especially for prayer, recognizing “that our united labors will by no means suffice to pluck up these pernicious seeds from the Lord’s field, unless the Heavenly Master of the vineyard shall mercifully help us in our endeavors.” To this end, the Holy Father closes his encyclical on a hopeful note trusting that, in so far as the Church perseveres in prayer, so will she be delivered her from her enemies.

It’s an altogether brilliant exhortation, which not only exposes Freemasonry’s plans, but also sets forth the appropriate tactical countermeasures; and yet its inherent vulnerability lies in the danger of alerting the opposition respecting how and where they ought to strike; for to the degree the Church is strengthened by a renewal of prayer, so too is she compromised by its corruption. A simple maxim, but nevertheless

staggering in its implications for the integrity of the Church's most powerful and essential prayer. Thus, if it was made painstakingly obvious that the Magisterium must, above all else, safeguard the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, it was no less evident that – should a spirit of liturgical revolution ever succeed in masquerading as source of renewal – it would signal a decisive conquest for the enemies of the Church.

And so it has.

An important question remains unanswered; namely, how would the Devil ever attain such power? Efforts at infiltration notwithstanding, it seems only fitting that God would nevertheless place special protections around the Church's supreme and existential act of worship. In light of this reality, it is therefore reasonable to conclude that should such a masterstroke ever successfully fall, it could only occur in an era when Satan had been granted unprecedented license by God himself in his designs to destroy the Church.

Which brings us to our fourth point, and the truly [frightening vision](#) of Pope Leo XIII in which he reportedly witnessed the unfolding of exactly this scenario:

October 13, 1884, Pope Leo XIII had just finished celebrating Mass in a chapel in the Vatican. At the Mass were a few Cardinals and members of the household staff. Suddenly the Pope stopped at the foot of the altar. He stood there for about 10 minutes, as if in a trance, his face ashen white. Then going straightway from the Chapel to his office, he composed the prayer to St. Michael and later issued instructions that it be said after all Low Masses everywhere in the world. He explained that, as he was about to leave the foot of the altar, he had suddenly heard voices – two voices, one kind and gentle, the other guttural and harsh. There he heard the voice of Satan in his pride, boasting to Our Lord: "I can destroy your Church." The gentle voice of Our Lord: "You can? Then go ahead and do so." Satan replied, "To do so, I need more time and more power." The Lord said, "How much time? How much power?" "75 to 100 years, and a greater power over those who will give themselves over to my service." was Satan's reply. Mysteriously our Lord said, "You have the time, you have the power. Do with them what you will."

While there are several permutations of this story in circulation, the most frequently [cited authorities](#) are the 1946 Pastoral Letter of Cardinal Nasalli Rocca, and the eyewitness testimony of Fr. Domenico Pechenino, first

recorded in the Italian journal *La Settimana del Clero* (those who would seek to discredit this last attestation due to its affiliation with the Society of St. Pius X need also to recognize that this source is unique in providing authentic translations from the original documents). What these accounts make clear, especially in the absence of evidence discrediting their veracity, is that there is good reason to conclude that Pope Leo's vision actually took place; more importantly, the vision itself offers good reason to conclude that the 20th century would witness a diabolical assault on the Church unlike any she had previously known.

To this end, if St. John Paul II is correct in proclaiming that the Holy Eucharist is the "source and summit of the Faith," it stands to reason that those attempting to effect its demise would seek to undermine the very ritual given for its manifestation and exaltation. And even though such an attack could never *entirely compromise* the validity of the Eucharistic consecration, it may nevertheless achieve a degree of distortion so pronounced that *it effectively obscures these Sacred Mysteries* from all but keenest (or most pious) observers.

Is it any wonder then that today more than 60% of American Catholics deny the reality of the [Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist](#)? It shouldn't be. The conclusion is obvious: when the Church ceases acting as if Christ is truly and substantially present in the Blessed Sacrament, the faithful stop believing that Christ is truly and substantially present in the Blessed Sacrament. This creates a vicious cycle: as belief begins to falter, praxis suffers further. Why else do we tolerate banal sanctuaries cluttered with laity, communion in the hand, indecent attire, rank irreverence, awful music, and unrestricted chatter in church? The list of abuses common in our era is lengthy, but the answer to why they persist is always the same: there is among Catholics today a widespread and practical apostasy from the central miraculous dogma of the Mass; that is, we no longer believe that the Eucharist is God Himself, veiled in hidden majesty, made present so that we may worship and adore Him; and consequently, we blithely construct liturgies which forsake the First Commandment while emphasizing shallow and insipid ways to amuse or gratify ourselves.

Excepting of course, the Church's ultimate indefectibility, if left unchecked, these efforts can only move us ever closer to the stated end of Freemasonry; namely, "*the destruction forever of Catholicism and even of the Christian idea.*" Again, this is because the Mass is the Church's [existential act of worship](#). She depends upon it for her very

existence, and thus the measure of its destruction will be the measure of her demise.

For some, it may be difficult to concede that the Church could stray so far afield, especially when it seems that her own Council ultimately acted as the catalyst; but when we recall that the popes repeatedly warned of a Masonic plot to destroy the Faith; that known Masons went on to disclose their intent to fundamentally transform the Mass at an Ecumenical Council; that even before their existence as a society, Our Lady prophesied that Masons – “shortly after the middle of the 20th century” – would besiege all seven sacraments; that both the Mass and the sacraments did in fact find themselves *dramatically altered* “shortly after the middle of the 20th century”; and that all this should occur precisely during an era when Satan had been granted unparalleled power to assault the Church; when we consider all these things together with the fact that a compromised Mass is the surest way to destroy the Faith, suddenly the specter of a revolutionary coup cloaked in the guise of conciliar renewal is brought into sharp and disturbing relief.

Those who have eyes let them see.

It is vital for us to understand how these most recent developments came to pass. In the final part, we will once more consider both the prevailing *zeitgeist* that so strongly influenced the era of Vatican II, and those things which followed in its wake.

PART III

According to [George Cardinal Pell](#), the build up to the Second Vatican Council “was an enormously exciting time, a time of great intellectual ferment. We were caught up in this great movement of reform, and we were wildly over-optimistic.” Indeed, many in the Church appeared so anxious to [throw open a few windows](#), and to let in some fresh air, they simply failed to properly investigate what sort of spirits were lurking about the sills. They weren’t evil, just overly eager to announce the [triumph of the progressive dream](#); yet unfortunately, given that excessive optimism is a thing all too easily manipulated, it was not long before the caution of Pius XII gave way to the aggiornamento of John XXIII, and the Bride of Christ found herself poised to take those first fateful steps down the proverbial garden path.

It began with the rehabilitation of certain suspect theologians whose work had taken on a distinctly Masonic flare. It is now a well [established fact](#) that John XXIII was often at pains to distinguish himself from the disciplinary rigor of his predecessor. As such, in a foretaste of “[the medicine of mercy](#)” which he would later prescribe in the Council’s opening address, [Good Pope John](#) not only reversed the [censure](#) and [suspension](#) placed on various proponents of *The New Theology*, but also personally appointed perhaps their [most notorious offender](#) as an expert advisor to the Council.

Indeed, so strong was the pontiff’s faith in the remedial power of mercy that he apparently thought it sufficient to restrain proponents of [the quintessentially Masonic idea](#) that truth “need not necessarily have a permanent value, but can, and indeed should, change with time and according to the demands of circumstance.” In other words, it was presumably thought when faced with a pledge of pastoral leniency, the advocates of ideological relativism – a dogma which Pope Leo XIII identified as [foundational to Freemasonry](#) – would somehow meekly resolve to abandon their errors.

Predictably, they did not get the memo, and consequently continued their mischief almost as soon as the Council began. Yet before exploring this theme any further, it should first be noted that despite their penchant for [promoting Masonic principles](#), it is not the intent of this essay to prove that the devotees of *The New Theology* were themselves Masons. It’s certainly a possibility, but ultimately it doesn’t really matter. What does matter is that their [teaching demonstrates](#) – whether wittingly or not – that they were at least informal disciples of the *Alta Vendita*, who little by little had been

“imbued with humanitarian principles” and brought “to the degree of cooking desired.”

Nowhere is this more evident than in the Council’s rejection of the carefully crafted preparatory schema. Drafted at the behest of John XXIII, the schema developed by the [Central Preparatory Commission](#) constituted the Church’s established means of steering a Council toward conclusions in concert Sacred Tradition. It would therefore seem wholly appropriate that these documents be accorded a place of honor in the Council’s proceedings.

But it was not to be.

As reported by Romano Amerio, an historian uniquely positioned as both a Council advisor and a member of the Central Preparatory Commission, “a distinctive feature of Vatican II is its *paradoxical outcome*, by which all the preparatory work that usually directs the debates, marks the outlook and foreshadows the results of a council, was nullified and rejected from the first session onward” (*Iota Unum*, 82). To this point, Amerio recalls that after heated debate regarding whether the plans drafted to guide the Council ought to be permitted to actually guide the Council, a vote was called to determine if the schema should continue to rule or be entirely redrafted.

The vote in favor of redrafting failed; as outlined in the Council bylaws, it did not garner the two-thirds majority needed to effect a procedural change. Consequently, it was announced that the existing schema would continue to act as the basis for the Council’s deliberations; and so they did, at least until later that evening when a series of extra-conciliar demands were delivered to John XXIII *insisting that he overrule the vote*.

This intervention, which at one blow reversed the Council’s decision and departed from the regulations governing the gathering, certainly constituted a breaking of the legal framework and a move from a collegial to a monarchical method of proceeding... In the circumstances in which it happened... this intervention constituted a classic case of a pope imposing his authority on a council, and is all the more remarkable in that the pope was at that time portrayed as a protector of the Council’s freedom. The exercise of authority was not, however, something the pope did on his own initiative, but the result of complaints and demands by those who treated the two-thirds majority required by the council rules as a “legal fiction” and ignored it in order to get the pope to accept the rule of a bare majority (83).

While the precise manner by which the pope was prevailed upon remains unclear, what is nevertheless manifest is how utterly conflicted the pontiff appears in this course of action. Only the month before, in his [opening address](#) to the Council, the same John XXIII had this to say about the preparatory schema:

There have elapsed three years of laborious preparation, during which a wide and profound examination was made regarding modern conditions of faith and religious practice, and of Christian and especially Catholic vitality. These years have seemed to us a first sign, an initial gift of celestial grace.

Thus, whatever ultimately led to the pope's abrupt about-face, the record shows that the most prominent proponent of this contempt for conciliar law was Cardinal Augustin Bea. Well-versed in the school of *The New Theology*, it is illuminating to read His Eminence's own words alongside those of Pius XII's encyclical *Humani Generis*. In an [interview given](#) on the eve of the Council, Cardinal Bea was asked about the obstacle of doctrinal intransigence in the ecumenical effort to foster union with the members of various Protestant sects.

Religious thought and scientific theology have developed differently among Catholics and among non-Catholic Christians. Protestantism has also felt the strong influence of modern philosophical systems, because it is less bound to tradition and less subject to authoritative control. Consequently, it is most difficult, not to say impossible, for our separated brothers to understand Catholic doctrine when it is presented in traditional terminology. On the other hand, it is very hard for Catholics to grasp the real sense of Protestant thought, for reasons bound up with our own history. Therefore, the Council could explain Catholic doctrine in a way that would take account of the changes of language that have occurred among our separated brothers from the time of the separation up to now... Besides, due to a similar historical evolution in our own theological formulations, through which definitive and immutable doctrine is expressed, only a particular aspect of any given doctrine is elaborated. Thus our theological propositions do not always express the full depth and richness of revealed doctrine. The Council could, therefore—with an eye to the aspirations of our separated brothers, their problems and difficulties—develop especially those aspects of revealed truth which answer their deepest needs and expectations.

Leaving aside the absurdly arrogant proposition that Catholic doctrine, when presented in traditional terminology, might be “impossible” for Protestants to understand, consider the Cardinal’s objectives in light of Pius XII’s [forceful admonition](#) of only a few years prior:

In theology some want to reduce to a minimum the meaning of dogmas; and to free dogma itself from terminology long established in the Church and from philosophical concepts held by Catholic teachers... They cherish the hope that when dogma is stripped of the elements which they hold to be extrinsic to divine revelation, it will compare advantageously with the dogmatic opinions of those who are separated from the unity of the Church and that in this way they will gradually arrive at a mutual assimilation of Catholic dogma with the tenets of the dissidents. Moreover, they assert that when Catholic doctrine has been reduced to this condition, a way will be found to satisfy modern needs, that will permit of dogma being expressed also by the concepts of modern philosophy... Some more audacious affirm that this can and must be done, because they hold that the mysteries of faith are never expressed by truly adequate concepts but only by approximate and ever changeable notions, in which the truth is to some extent expressed, but is necessarily distorted. Wherefore they do not consider it absurd, but altogether necessary, that theology should substitute new concepts in place of the old ones in keeping with the various philosophies which in the course of time it uses as its instruments, so that it should give human expression to divine truths in various ways which are even somewhat opposed, but still equivalent, as they say. They add that the history of dogmas consists in the reporting of the various forms in which revealed truth has been clothed, forms that have succeeded one another in accordance with the different teachings and opinions that have arisen over the course of the centuries.

Having thus summarized precisely the mindset of Cardinal Bea and his collaborators, the Holy Father concludes his discourse with the following denunciation of their thought:

It is evident from what We have already said, that such tentatives not only lead to what they call dogmatic relativism, but that they actually contain it.

It is difficult to imagine a more resounding condemnation of the ideas that so obviously informed Bea’s conciliar agenda. And lest there be any confusion about the matter, [the preparatory schema](#) were drafted using precisely the kind of traditional terminology – so resistant to novelty – that Pius endorsed but Bea deplored.

In light of this reality, the unlawful suppression of the schema at the hands of the Cardinal Bea contingent constituted a real coup for the adherents of an ideology manifestly infected with Freemasonic principles; but worse still, according to Amerio's findings, it appears the revolt was also planned in advance:

[T]he French Academician, Jean Guitton, relates of something told him by Cardinal Tisserant. When showing Guitton a painting made from a photograph, which depicted Tisserant himself and six other cardinals, the Dean of the Sacred College said: "This picture is historic, or rather, symbolic. It shows the meeting we had before the opening of the Council, when we decided to block the first session by refusing to accept the tyrannical rules laid down by John XXIII" (43).

In other words, the coup was carried out by a cabal, and as such it is no surprise that Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani also found himself in the cross hairs of this conciliar offensive. As the head of the Central Preparatory Committee, he was naturally the prime defender of the schema. Thus, in a manner befitting the worst sort of mischief, the attack against him would take the form of humiliation. Not content to simply dismiss the schema, their champion needed to be defeated as well. Consider the following account from what [John Allen](#) calls "one of the most perceptive books ever written about the Second Vatican Council."

On October 30, the day after his seventy-second birthday, Cardinal Ottaviani addressed the Council to protest against the drastic changes which were being suggested in the Mass. "Are we seeking to stir up wonder, or perhaps scandal, among the Christian people, by introducing changes in so venerable a rite, that has been approved for so many centuries and is now so familiar? The rite of Holy Mass should not be treated as if it were a piece of cloth to be refashioned according to the whim of each generation." Speaking without a text, because of his partial blindness, he exceeded the ten-minute time limit which all had been requested to observe. Cardinal Tisserant, Dean of the Council Presidents, showed his watch to Cardinal Alfrink, who was presiding that morning. When Cardinal Ottaviani reached fifteen minutes, Cardinal Alfrink rang the warning bell. But the speaker was so engrossed in his topic that he did not notice the bell, or purposely ignored it. At a signal from Cardinal Alfrink, a technician switched off the microphone. After confirming the fact by tapping the instrument, Cardinal Ottaviani stumbled back to his seat in humiliation. The most powerful cardinal in the Roman Curia had been silenced, and the Council Fathers clapped with glee.

The scene is positively surreal; here we have the same body charged with protecting Sacred Tradition openly mocking a plea to preserve it. For all the endless talk about the [Holy Spirit and Vatican II](#), it is quite alarming to find the Council so dismissive of those who simply wished to respect what they had received. It is one thing to undertake reforms from a posture of submission to Tradition, but it is quite another when – as we have already seen – one's agenda necessitates the marginalization of that Tradition. Contrast this attitude with that of [Pope St. Leo the Great](#), who once admonished his bishops to

teach nothing new but instill into all men's breasts those things, which the Fathers of revered memory have with harmony of statement taught...that the ears of the faithful may attest that we preach nothing else than what we received from our forefathers... Accordingly, both in the rule of Faith and in the observance of discipline, let the standard of antiquity be maintained throughout.

In the face of such disconcerting events, it is not difficult to imagine that John XXIII may well have lived to regret ever calling the Council; but whatever the case may be, when the Ottaviani example proves to be more of a [feature than a fluke](#), it is time to reconsider what the Council actually achieved.

Was it renewal, or *revolution*?

Admittedly, even now, the latter prospect creates no small amount of dissonance in the minds of those who have only ever heard the Council called "great"; but once again, [upon considering](#) the monumental [collapse of the Faith](#) in the [wake of the Council](#), it is not enough to go on blaming fecklessness and false implementation. After all, there has been [no end](#) to the claims that the pontificate of [St. John Paul II](#) *already accomplished* the definitive [interpretation and implementation](#) of Vatican II.

If that's the case, what options are left?

Although it's certainly easier (and in some respects, preferable) to believe that the conciliar texts are simply above reproach, at some point these [admittedly ambiguous](#) documents need to be judged, not by [ignoring their deficiencies](#), but rather by [a real episcopal rigor](#) which insists that faith without works is dead. If this can be accomplished, the Church might finally regain some clarity regarding how to distinguish the wheat of doctrinal

truth from the chaff of pastoral novelty; and moreover, she might recall, that the chaff is sown, not just through mistakes and mishaps, but also through premeditated malice. Indeed she might even begin to remember

1. That there is in fact an organized cabal – expressly acknowledged by popes Gregory XVI, Pius IX, and Leo XIII – whose stated purpose is to infiltrate and destroy the Roman Catholic Church.
2. That a member of this cabal, a priest who was identified as such and excommunicated accordingly, went on to predict – some 90 years in advance – that an Ecumenical Council would subvert the liturgical and sacramental life of the Church.
3. That the exact character of this cabal, and a description of its 20th century assault on the sacraments, was identified *by name* in an approved apparition of Our Lady *over a century before* it ever came into being.
4. That the timing of the conciliar changes in the Church's liturgy conforms credibly with Pope Leo XIII's alleged vision of Satan's 20th century ascendancy.
5. That the historical events which led to these changes effectively invited the destructive influence of the infiltrators.

If the Church should ever truly remember all this, it is certain that almost overnight she would forsake the anthropocentric efforts to market [relevance](#) and [entertainment](#) (i.e. pandering to modernity), and instead return to her Christocentric mandate to [boldly proclaim the truth](#) and [reverently worship its Author](#) (i.e., pleasing God).

And why is that?

Because she would remember not only that she is at war – but more importantly – that *she was once the victor*. Therein lies the diabolical irony of the whole thesis of adaption. It's a complete farce. The Church already knows how to win the war because she's done it before; thus, all this nonsense about updating and speaking the language of modernity is nothing but a pleasant sounding distraction.

To be clear, this has nothing to do with making use of advances in technology – which the Church has always done (often leading the way) – but instead about answering Dietrich Von Hildebrand's timeless rhetorical question; namely, do we best serve God (and thus man) by soaring up to Him, or by dragging Him down into our workaday world? Are we to

promote reverence or peddle relevance? In the face of such an obvious answer, the real question is: *why has the Church, for the better part of century, been acting as if the opposite were true?*

The answer to this question is also obvious: the Church's enemies seem to understand this truth far better than many of her self-professed defenders. And thus, having tasted too many defeats at the hands of the Church's supreme liturgical arsenal, the likes of the Alta Vendita have made it their mission to convince the Bride of Christ that her victory lies not in spiritual arms, but rather material ends; and that her mission should therefore be to appeal to man rather than appease the Most High. This deception is critical to the stated end goal of the Church's enemies, for to serve man instead of God is tantamount to the Church committing suicide. It strikes at the very heart of her existence; but sadly, until her Magisterium decides to refocus its agenda, the confusion among the faithful will only continue to spread.

For all those who sincerely believe that the Church was meant to grow simply by attraction (i.e. by the positive witness of charitable works) – with no recourse to conversion, confrontation, and condemnation – I will conclude by recalling the eight words that affected the greatest mass conversion in history: "[Yet forty days, and Ninive shall be destroyed.](#)"

Perhaps some day, when the Church regains sufficient clarity, she will have the courage to resume a form of worship that is able to "accompany" and "encounter" a sinful world, not with pastoral obsequience, but rather a radical call to *repentance*.

About the Author:

Brian Miles is an avocational author of fiction, poetry, and the occasional essay. He received a BA in Religious Studies from the University of Colorado and an MA in Divinity from the University of Chicago. He is a convert to Catholicism from Evangelical Protestantism. He lives with his wife in Omaha, Nebraska.

About OnePeterFive

OnePeterFive is journal of Catholic information, news, and commentary, dedicated to “Rebuilding Catholic Culture and Restoring Catholic Tradition.”

To read more, visit us online at www.onepeterfive.com

The text of this eBook originally appeared as a three-part series of articles in April, 2015. The text has been edited to fit this eBook edition.