



Boston Catholic Journal



NIHIL NISI JESUM

DEDICATED TO MARY, MOTHER OF GOD

---

[www.boston-catholic-journal.com](http://www.boston-catholic-journal.com)

[editor@boston-catholic-journal.com](mailto:editor@boston-catholic-journal.com)

# THE ARGUMENT AGAINST ECUMENISM:



“DOST THOU BETRAY THE SON OF MAN WITH A KISS?”

# WHY DID CHRIST DIE ON THE CROSS?

**This** question — and any conceivable answer to it — is the most compelling argument against any speculative proposition that could logically lend itself to the project of what we have come to understand as “ecumenism” (a word first coined in 1948) — the novel and ultimately implausible notion that was the principal motivation behind the convocation of the Second Vatican Council. It is an unavoidable question that is absolutely unanswerable in terms consistent with the entirely specious — or better yet, factitious — “ecumenical” project:

**Why** was it necessary for Christ to die on the Cross — if “any religion” suffices to bring man to God, offers salvation, and ultimately leads men to Heaven?

**Why** do we — indeed, **how** could we — maintain the *indispensability* of the Holy Catholic Church — in other words, on what grounds do we maintain that it is necessary — rather than merely redundant and ultimately superfluous — **if any**

**and every other religion is the sufficient means to the salvation of souls and the attainment of Heaven?**

Francis — the pre-eminent product and culmination of Vatican II — recently and finally made this clear — indeed even signed a [document](#) with one of Islam’s Grand Imams declaring that:

**“The pluralism and the diversity of religions, color, sex, race and language are willed by God** in His wisdom, through which He created human beings,” ... “This divine wisdom is the source from which the right to freedom of belief and the freedom to be different derives. Therefore, the fact that people are forced to adhere to a certain religion or culture must be rejected, as too the imposition of a cultural way of life that others do not accept.”

Two years earlier he had emphasized this radical insistence on ecumenism through a different tack, the absolutely clear terms of which by now we are all familiar:

**“It is not licit that you convince them of your faith; proselytism is the strongest poison against the ecumenical path.”**<sup>1</sup>

**It is not the proclamation of the Gospel and the conversion of souls to Jesus Christ and His Holy Catholic Church that is paramount — and mandated by Christ when He told His Apostles **“Go therefore and teach all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.”** (St. Matthew 28.19-20) — but the heretical program of Ecumenism that is central to Christianity.**

## To Reiterate the Point:

Why, then, was it necessary for Christ to die on the Cross — if “any religion” suffices to bring man to God, offers salvation, and ultimately leads men to Heaven?

The answer to this question had apparently been peripheral to the “Council Fathers” and the answer to it *still* eludes the sophistic casuistry of Catholic and Protestant theologians alike, as it had in their collaborative construction of the Council and the documents that emerged from it.

At first the heresy of ecumenism was confined to nominally “Christian denominations” — but as the many ineluctable contradictions unfolded, it increasingly and necessarily moved beyond Christianity to encompass all religions — and no religion at all.

Let us be as forthright as possible: **why** — **for what possible reason** — was it necessary for Jesus Christ to suffer and die on the Cross ... if — **if** — there was *another* way, another religion, in fact *any* religion that suffices (including that of the Canaanite god Moloch who required child sacrifice, and the Aztec god Huitzilopochtli — who also required human sacrifice), to say nothing of the Trimurti of the Hindus, Allah of the Muslims, Mormonism, Zoroastrianism, Judaism, Gnosticism, etc. or, in fact, **no religion at all** as Francis’s argument implies?

## “The god of Surprises?”

Absurdity may, in fact, be a prerogative of *Francis’s* fabricated “**god of surprises**” — but it is *not* the same God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; not the God revealed in His Incarnate Son, and certainly not the God worshipped in the Catholic Church.

**If it was not necessary for Christ to die on the Cross** to redeem man from his sins and so open Heaven to men — then His immolation on Calvary was purely gratuitous. **He suffered and died needlessly.** God the Father capriciously and wantonly crucified His Only-Begotten Son. The Crucifixion was pointless, and the agony of His Mother of no consequence. This is the necessary conclusion to the spurious attempt to both initiate and implement all that is inherently irreconcilable in the disastrous project of “ecumenism”. **Any other religion would have been sufficient without Christ and the Cross.**

As a postscript I suggest that you not attempt to use the “**ut unum sint**” (“that they may be one”) citation from Holy Scripture. There are too many citations to the contrary. Christ was clearly speaking of His Apostles:

“And now I am not in the world, and these are in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep them in Thy name whom Thou has given me; that they may be one, as We also are. **While I was with them,** I kept them in Thy name. **Those whom Thou gavest me have I kept; and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition,** that the scripture may be fulfilled.” (Saint John 17.11-12)

If you argue that the **revelation** of God is a gradually evolving and on-going process, a continual “up-dating” of His most holy will so that He, Who **created** the world, can keep pace with the times and man’s “evolving consciousness”— then Jesus is not the final Word of God after all:

“God, after He spoke long ago to the fathers in the prophets in many portions and in many ways, **in these last days has spoken to us in His Son**, whom He appointed heir of all things, through whom also He made the world.” (Hebrews 1.1-2)

The revelation of God was completed in His Son, and ended upon the death of the last Apostle, Saint John.

This is long-established Catholic Doctrine.

But **now, we are to believe, God is going to speak through *Francis* and abolish this doctrine** by revealing that Christianity (Catholicism) is **not the only way to the Father** despite what Christ Himself said:

“I am the way, and the truth, and the life. **No man cometh to the Father, but by me**.” (Saint John 14.6)

Francis’s proclamation — without precedent in Catholic history — is nothing less than a betrayal of Christ, the Teachings of Christ’s Church, the Sacred Deposit of Faith and is a grievous wound in our Holy Mother the Church whom he has also betrayed. It is heresy.

And if this is not heresy (specifically the heresy of **Indifferentism**) then *nothing* qualifies for the definition.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.lifesitenews.com/opinion/pope-to-teen-girl-proselytism-is-the-strongest-poison-against-the-ecumenica>

Geoffrey K. Mondello  
Editor  
Boston Catholic Journal  
April 22, 2019



