



# Boston Catholic Journal



NIHIL NISI IESUM

Dedicated to Mary, Mother of God

Salus Animarum Suprema Lex Esto (Canon Law 175)

The Salvation of Souls is the Supreme Law in the Church



Betrayest thou

the Son of Man

with a kiss?



## Vatican II and the Argument Against Ecumenism

**Why ... Why ... did Christ Die on the Cross — if “any religion” whatsoever will bring you salvation?**

**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 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?*

Bergoglio — 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>*

Remarkably — and sadly— *this is not a new*, it is only stated with greater emphasis by Francis, but was also — and for many Traditional Catholics, surprisingly the mind of Benedict XVI:

*“The Church does not engage in proselytism. Instead, she grows by ‘attraction.’”<sup>2</sup>*

We see that *both Francis and Benedict XVI* were Ecumenists (we must remember that [Benedict XVI on October 27, 2011 committed the same folly and in the same venue as his predecessor John Paul II in Assisi 27 Oct 1986](#)) — and *both promoted and taught* what is in contradiction to the *Great Commission* (St. Matthew 28.16-20), a *central* tenet of Catholicism (as well as *other* Christian denominations), and the last words Christ spoke to His Apostles before His Ascension:

*“Going therefore, teach ye all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.” (St. Matthew 28.19-20)*

For Francis, it is not the *proclamation of the Gospel* and the *conversion of souls* to Jesus Christ and His Holy Catholic Church that is paramount — rather, it is 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.

Considering his predecessors too timid in implementing the ecumenical venture, he is determined to be the historical champion of unbridled ecumenism, not by introducing something new, but by stridently underscoring, and by every means amplifying, *one* of the most controversial declarations, and *two* of the most fundamental tenets of Vatican II: *Nostra Aetate*<sup>3</sup> on the one hand, which, for example, teaches that Muslims and Christians (oddly) worship the *same* God; and *Unitatis redintegratio*,<sup>4</sup> or *Decree on Ecumenism*, an effort to establish unity between the one Holy Catholic Church and the 45,000 unique Protestant denominations around the world as of this writing<sup>5</sup> — and none of which have entered into unity with the Catholic Church that, for its part, has surrendered so much of its beloved and uniquely Catholic identity in an effort to make it “less offensive” to “the separated brethren” — who, for *their ecumenical part* have surrendered nothing. Ecumenism, after 70 years, has proven to be a one-way highway to an unfinished bridge ending abruptly, with no guard rail, at the other end.

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; if, in fact — as Francis appears to insist — *any* religion suffices to bring man to God? Is Francis, then, stating something radical and new in this growing *post-Catholic* Conciliar Church of Vatican II that appears to be repudiating its identity with unprecedented rigor in the papacy of Francis? Not in the least. Francis has always vaunted himself as the one who will bring to its ineluctable conclusion what was only nascent and inceptive in the documents of Vatican II, especially, as we have noted, in *Nostra Aetate* and *Unitatis redintegratio*.

Why not, then, *any* other god or any *other* religion? There is no indication in these documents, decrees, or declarations of the exclusion of the Trimurti of the Hindus, of Akal Murat of Sikhism, of Elohim of Mormonism, or of Ahura Mazda of Zoroastrianism; nor of Gnosticism, or the self-apotheosis in New Age Spirituality, and so on — or, in fact, *no religion at all*. for as Francis openly states, “even atheists go to Heaven.”<sup>6</sup>

## “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 much abused “*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 we are now to believe that 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 betrays so capriciously and so often. 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/>

<sup>2</sup> Benedict XVI at a meeting of Latin American and Caribbean bishops in Aparecida, Brazil, in 2007

<sup>3</sup> [https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decl\\_19651028\\_nostra-aetate\\_en.html](https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651028_nostra-aetate_en.html)

<sup>4</sup> [https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decree\\_19641121\\_unitatis-redintegratio\\_en.html](https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19641121_unitatis-redintegratio_en.html)

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.gordonconwell.edu/center-for-global-christianity/>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/pope-francis-assures-atheists-you-don-t-have-to-believe-in-god-to-go-to-heaven-8810062.html>

\* The belief that all religions ultimately derive from God in different, inconsistent, and contradictory beliefs — even within what is broadly understood as Christianity.

Other manifestations of God are held to occur *outside* of Christianity, and generally come as what are understood as epiphanies or awakenings *by* and *within* different individuals, and all of them are equally acceptable to God, capable of bringing their adherents to *salvation* ...generally understood as Heaven or absolute felicity, although this is sometimes simply viewed merely as a state of “enlightenment,” and nothing more) then *nothing* qualifies for the definition.

Geoffrey K. Mondello  
Editor  
Boston Catholic Journal

July 21, 2024  
Feast of St. Praxedes



Copyright © 2004 - 2024 Boston Catholic Journal. All rights reserved.