

# I

## CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN MYSELF AND THE ARCHBISHOP OF BANGALORE REGARDING THE NOVUS ORDO.

By DR. C. B. ANDRADE

- ① On November 7, 1980, I addressed a letter (copy not now available) to the Archbishop, requesting permission for the Traditional Latin rite Mass to be celebrated, privately, in my home for the benefit of my aged, chronically ill and crippled relatives, as we were unable to accept the "New Mass"
- ② The Archbishop's Reply of 14.11.1980 (see II enclosed)
- ③ My Reply of 26.11.80 to The Archbishop. (see III enclosed)
- ④ Receiving no Reply to the above letter I again addressed the Archbishop on 1.11.82, this time regarding the Heresy in Eucharistic Prayer IV (see IV enclosed)
- ⑤ As the Archbishop still did not reply, I sent an open letter, dated 6.1.83, enclosing copies of my correspondence with him, to several senior priests in India. (see V enclosed)
- ⑥ As no reply was received to the above from any of the priests addressed I mailed a "follow-up" open letter dated 20.1.83 to them (see VI enclosed). To date no reply has been received.

Most Rev. Dr.P.Arokiaswamy  
Archbishop of Bangalore

Phone 55438

Archbishop's House,  
18 Miller's Road,  
Bangalore 560 046.

14th November 1980.

Dr. C. B. Andrade,  
10/3 Benson Cross Road,  
Benson Town,  
Bangalore 560 046.

Dear Mr. Andrade,

I was duly in receipt of your letter of November 7, 1980.  
Sorry for the delay in replying to it.

I regret to say that I am unable to comply with your request. I know your sincerity but I cannot accept your view that you cannot accept this "New Mass". This Mass is approved by the Church and your rejecting it would mean that you do not accept the rulings of the Church. It would even amount to your questioning the infallibility of the Church.

I shall keep you in my prayers.

With my prayerful best wishes and cordial blessing to you  
and to your brother and sister,

Yours sincerely in Xt.,

P. Arokiaswamy  
Archbishop of Bangalore



Here is the doctrine of Papal Infallibility as formulated at the First Vatican Council: "The Roman Pontiff, when he speaks ex Cathedra - that is, when in the exercise of his office as pastor and teacher of all Christians he defines, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, a doctrine of faith or morals to be held by the whole Church is by reason of the Divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer wished His Church to be endowed in defining doctrines of faith and morals; ---."

In explaining this definition The Catholic Encyclopedia says: "---the conditions required for ex cathedra teaching are mentioned in the Vatican decree: (a) The pontiff must teach in his public and official capacity as pastor and doctor of all Christians and not merely in his capacity as a theologian, preacher or allocutionist, nor in his capacity as a mere ordinary of the Diocese of Rome. It must be clear that he speaks as spiritual head of the Universal Church. (b) Then, it is only when, in this capacity, he teaches some doctrine of faith or morals that he is infallible. (c) Further it must be sufficiently evident that he intends to teach with all the fullness and finality of his Supreme Apostolic authority, in other words, that he wishes to determine some point of doctrine in an absolute and final and irrevocable way, or to

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

SECRET

define it in the technical sense---. (d) Finally, for an ex cathedra decision it must be clear that the Pope intends to bind the whole Church, to demand assent from all the faithful to his teaching under pain of incurring spiritual shipwreck (naufragium fidei) according to the expression used by Pius IX in defining the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Can the above definition be applicable

Here is the doctrine of Papal Infallibility as formulated at the First Vatican Council: "The Roman Pontiff, when he speaks ex Cathedra - that is, when in the exercise of his office as pastor and teacher of all Christians he defines, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, a doctrine of faith or morals to be held by the whole Church is by reason of the Divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer wished His Church to be endowed in defining doctrines of faith and morals; ---."

In explaining this definition The Catholic Encyclopedia says: "---the conditions required for ex cathedra teaching are mentioned in the Vatican decree: (a) The pontiff must teach in his public and official capacity as pastor and doctor of all Christians and not merely in his capacity as a theologian, preacher or allocutionist, nor in his capacity as a mere ordinary of the Diocese of Rome. It must be clear that he speaks as spiritual head of the Universal Church. (b) Then, it is only when, in this capacity, he teaches some doctrine of faith or morals that he is infallible. (c) Further it must be sufficiently evident that he intends to teach with all the fullness and finality of his Supreme Apostolic authority, in other words, that he wishes to determine some point of doctrine in an absolute and final and irrevocable way, or to

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

SECRET

define it in the technical sense---. (d) Finally, for an ex cathedra decision it must be clear that the Pope intends to bind the whole Church, to demand assent from all the faithful to his teaching under pain of incurring spiritual shipwreck (naufragium fidei) according to the expression used by Pius IX in defining the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Can the above definition be applicable

define it in the technical sense---. (d) Finally, for an ex cathedra decision it must be clear that the Pope intends to bind the whole Church to demand assent from all the faithful to his teaching under pain of incurring spiritual shipwreck (naufragium fidei) according to the expression used by Pius IX in defining the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Can the above definition and explanation of Papal Infallibility be applicable to the "approval" of the Novus Ordo by Paul VI? Obviously not. Here is what Paul VI himself said on this point: "But let everyone understand well that nothing has been changed in the essence of our traditional Mass. Some perhaps will have gotten the idea that by the introduction of such and such a ceremony, or such and such a rubric being added, that such things constitute or hide alterations or minimizations of defined truths or ideas sanctioned by the Catholic Faith---.

But there is nothing to this idea absolutely. First of all, because ritual and rubrics are not in themselves a matter of dogmatic definition. I do not accept that the changes are merely a matter of ritual and rubrics but Paul VI himself says so and therefore they are not subject to a "de fide pronouncement". On the basis of this statement alone, I challenge your accusation that I am questioning the infallibility of the Church.

But let me drive the point home further. Even though the prayers of the Mass contain affirmations of faith, these prayers are not themselves ex cathedra pronouncements. The Church does familiarise her children with the doctrines of the Faith by embodying these doctrines in her liturgical prayers. However, the main purpose of the prayers is not to teach - any more than the main purpose of any prayer is to teach - but to worship and communicate with God. The liturgy does not define the truths of the Faith, it assents to them, meditates on them, glories in them, and thanks God for revealing them. The legislation of the Church on liturgical matters, and particularly on the Holy Mass, falls under the heading of discipline or legislation rather than under teaching or doctrine.

From all the above, it is quite clear that Paul VI's imposition of the Novus Ordo is in no sense of the term an act of his infallible teaching authority. It must be assessed as a pastoral act, one which pertains to the discipline and practice of the Roman Rite. It did not so much as touch the Eastern Rites and, by this fact alone, cannot be said to be directed to the Universal Church. Since there is no question of Papal Infallibility being involved, it is not at all out of order to question the morality, the licity, the validity, the orthodoxy, the nature, the purposes, the wisdom or any other aspect of this Novus Ordo. This being so, I do not see how you can, without the slightest shred of evidence in support, accuse me of questioning the infallibility of the Church. As for rejecting the rulings of the Church, I ask you, which Church? for the rulings of this conciliar ecumenical Church are often in contradiction to the rulings of the Church as I knew it until Vatican II. I could give many examples to substantiate this statement but that would fill a small book. However, here, let me just remind you of Church rulings on Joan of Arc and Galileo. Let me remind you also:

- 1) that non-Catholic theologians agree that the "new mass" is not the same as the Catholic Mass which we used to have and which they could never accept. They, however, do accept and use the Novus Ordo even though they do not believe in Transubstantiation.
- 2) That the "Missa Normativa", which was the same as this Novus Ordo, was rejected, in October 1967, by the majority of the members of an Episcopal Synod in Rome.
- 3) That the Novus Ordo was rejected by Cardinal Ottaviani and a group of competent Roman theologians. As you are aware, Cardinal Ottaviani was Prefect of the Holy Office for more than a quarter of a century under 4 popes: do you accuse him, also, of questioning the infallibility of the Church?

If I have sought your permission to have the Tridentine Mass offered in my home, it is not because I believe that this Mass has been banned. It has not and cannot be banned but the ignorant clergy think it has been, and hence my request to you because I cannot celebrate the Mass

... I have sought your permission to have the Tridentine Mass offered in my home, it is not because I believe that this Mass has been banned. It has not and cannot be banned but the ignorant clergy think it has been, and hence my request to you because I cannot celebrate the Mass

... I have sought your permission to have the Tridentine Mass offered in my home, it is not because I believe that this Mass has been banned. It has not and cannot be banned but the ignorant clergy think it has been, and hence my request to you because I cannot celebrate the Mass



myself. I could provide a great deal of evidence to prove that the Tridentine Mass has not and cannot be banned but that, too, would fill the pages of a small book. For the nonce, let me just say that a millenary custom gives the Tridentine Mass an imprescriptible right. Such a custom could be abolished only on condition of its being declared bad, and that is impossible; or by discovering that it had, of itself, ceased to exist which, of course, is not true.

It is your duty as a bishop to provide satisfactory answers to the points I have raised and I look forward to your reply.

Yours sincerely in Christ,

C. B. ANDRADE

Thank you for your letter of November 14, 1980, in reply to mine of November 10, 1980.

144

Straswalchen 6. 11. 82

Sehr geehrter Herr Heller!

In Ihrem Begleitzettel zur Einricht Nr. 3 haben Sie auch die Bemerkung „ Falls terminmöglich werden die Bischöfe auch weitere Zentren bzw. Gruppen besuchen.

Dringend bitte ich um den Besuch eines der beiden Exzellenzen zur Konsekration meines Hauptaltars im Zentrum der bei der Abtragung einer Kirche auseinandergenommen wurde, jahrelang in einem Abstellraum lag und 1979 erworben werden konnte. Reliquiengrab und Kreuze sind unberührt nur längs des Altaraufbaus stand weggeschnitten werden. Auch Messkelche sind <sup>nach</sup> zu weihen.

Falls ein Besuch möglich wäre bitte ich um

myself. I could provide a great deal of evidence to prove that the Tridentine Mass has not and cannot be banned but that, too, would fill the pages of a small book. For the nonce, let me just say that a millenary custom gives the Tridentine Mass an imprescriptible right. Such a custom could be abolished only on condition of its being declared bad, and that is impossible; or by discovering that it had, of itself, ceased to exist: which, of course, is not true.

It is your duty as a bishop to provide satisfactory answers to the points I have raised and I look forward to your reply.

Yours sincerely in Christ,

C. B. ANDRADE

MEMORANDUM OF THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF ARCHBISHOPS OF BANGALORE  
MEMORANDUM OF THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF ARCHBISHOPS OF BANGALORE  
MEMORANDUM OF THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF ARCHBISHOPS OF BANGALORE

IV

Dr. C. B. Andrade,  
10/3 Benson Cross Road,  
Bangalore 560 046.

~~1-11-1982~~ 1.11.82

The Most Rev. Dr. P. Arckiaswamy,  
Archbishop of Bangalore,  
Archbishop's House,  
10 Miller's Road,  
Bangalore 560 046.

Your Grace,

In your reply of the 14th November, 1980, to my letter of the 7th November, 1980, you stated: "--- I cannot accept your view that you cannot accept this 'New Mass'. This Mass is approved by the Church and your rejecting it would mean that you do not accept the rulings of the Church. I would even amount to your questioning the infallibility of the Church".

My three-page refutation (26-1-1980) of your above statement has remained unanswered to this day (there is a saying that silence is the most difficult argument to meet; and the conciliar hierarchy and clergy use it as a finely-honed weapon against awkward questions from the laity). I, therefore, enclose an article which proves on theological grounds that this "New Mass" is heretical and superstitious.

If I am wrong in what I have written, it is your duty as a pastor of souls to demonstrate in clear terms where I am wrong. Please do not have recourse to silence because, if you do, I shall have no option but to come to the conclusion that the arguments I have put forward are unanswerable.

With every good wish,

Sincerely in Christ,

C. B. Andrade.

Dt. 1-11-1982.

enclosed with my letter of 1.4.82

THE "NEW MASS" VIOLATES THE FIRST COMMANDMENT OF GOD

Compiled by Dr. C. B. Andrade

The "New Mass" violates the First Commandment of God regarding the Commission of Sacrilege and also with regard to superstition. In this article it is not intended to present a detailed argument to demonstrate that the "New Mass" is sacrilegious: that pleasure must be deferred to a subsequent composition. For the present it is proposed to demonstrate that this so-called "New Mass" as it is in use in all the churches of India and the world falls within the theological definition of superstition.

Superstition

Contrary to popular understanding, superstition, from a Catholic theological standpoint, is not simply the practice of divination and sorcery. The use of the term superstition to describe such practices, is an application of the word "in a restricted sense". (Rev. Heribert Jones O.P.M. Cap. J.C.D. Moral Theology, Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1961, p.98). Strictly speaking, "superstition is a false worship of the true God or true worship paid to a false God" (Ibid: p.97). By this definition, false worship of the true God would occur in worship that mixes error with truth. As Fr. Jones puts it: "God is worshipped in a false manner if one mingles religious errors and deception with the worship of the true God (Cultus Falsus) or if God is worshipped by the practice of senseless, very unusual or ridiculous ceremonies (Cultus Vanus)" (Ibid.)

I am not concerned in this instance to deal with the matter of Cultus Vanus although this is widespread enough in this country in such places as the National Biblical Catechetical and Liturgical Centre, seminaries, etc. ~~and in the first type of superstition (i.e. Cultus Falsus, or the mingling of religious errors with the worship of the true God)~~ and to show that the "New Mass" in English (and various other vernaculars) which is used with the approval of the Vatican and the bishops of India ~~and the world~~, contains explicit and literal religious error. As such, it must be stated that ~~this "New Mass" in India and the world, is an offence against the First Commandment of God, under which falls the sin of superstition.~~ It can, therefore, be stated that the new worship is superstitious because it "mingles religious errors with the worship of the true God." In order to understand the nature of the error to be pointed out later, it is necessary first to provide some background.

Since the earliest years of the Church there have been attempts to undermine the doctrine of the Trinity. The various heresies that attacked this central doctrine of the Catholic Faith frequently approached it in different ways. At the end of the first century, "Judaic heretics, Geronthus and the Ebionites, holding rigidly to the doctrine of One Person in God denied the Divinity of Christ. Towards the end of the second century, the so-called Monarchianists taught that there was only One Person in God." (Ludwig Ott., Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma, St. Louis, Missouri: B. Herder Book Co., 1957, p. 100). The Arian heresy, which Arius taught that the Son of God did not exist from eternity but was "a creature of the Father, produced by Him from nothing before all other creatures". (Ibid., p.51). Thus, the Arian heresy taught that the Son of God "is not, in the proper and true sense, God, but only in the improper sense, insofar as He, in anticipation of His merits, was adopted by the Father as Son". (Ibid. p.51).

In the year 325, the "First General Council at Nicaea" in opposition to and in condemnation of this heresy, "drafted a creed which confesses Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, His generation from the substance of the Father, His true Divinity and His consubstantiality with the Father". (Ibid. p.51). The semi-Arians followed, and so on down

Article enclosed with my letter of 1. 11. 52

THE "NEW MASS" VIOLATES THE FIRST COMMANDMENT OF GOD

Compiled by Dr. G. B. Andrade

The "New Mass" violates the First Commandment of God regarding the Commission of Sacrilege and also with regard to superstition. In this article it is not intended to present a detailed argument to demonstrate that the "New Mass" is sacrilegious: that pleasure must be deferred to a subsequent composition. For the present it is proposed to demonstrate that this so-called "New Mass" as it is in use in all the churches of India and the world falls within the theological definition of superstition.

Superstition

Contrary to popular understanding, superstition, from a Catholic theological standpoint, is not simply the practice of divination and sorcery. The use of the term superstition to describe such practices, is an application of the word "in a restricted sense". (Rev. Heribert Jones O.F.M. Cap. J.C.D. Moral Theology, Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1961, p.98). Strictly speaking, "superstition is a false worship of the true God or true worship paid to a false God" (Ibid: p.97). By this definition, false worship of the true God would occur in worship that mixes error with truth. As Fr. Jones puts it: "God is worshipped in a false manner if one mingles religious errors and deception with the worship of the true God (Cultus Falsus) or if God is worshipped by the practice of senseless, very unusual or ridiculous ceremonies (Cultus Vanus)" (Ibid.)

I am not concerned in this instance to deal with the matter of Cultus Vanus although this is widespread enough in this country in such places as the National Biblical Catechetical and Liturgical Centre, seminaries, convents, etc. Its purpose is to focus on the first type of superstition (i.e. Cultus Falsus, or the mingling of "religious errors and deception with the worship of the true God") and to show that the "New Mass" in English (and various other vernaculars) which is used with the approval of the Vatican and the bishops of India and the world, contains explicit and literal religious error. As such, it must be stated that this "New Mass" as it is used in the parish churches in India and the world, is an offence against the First Commandment of God, under which falls the sin of superstition. It can, therefore, be stated that the new worship is superstitious because it "mingles religious errors --- with the worship of the true God." In order to understand the nature of the error to be pointed out later, it is necessary first to provide some background.

Since the earliest years of the Church there have been attempts to undermine the doctrine of the Trinity. The various heresies that attacked this central doctrine of the Catholic Faith frequently approached it in different ways. At the end of the first century, "Judaic heretics, Cerinthus and the Ebionites, holding rigidly to the doctrine of One Person in God denied the Divinity of Christ. Towards the end of the second century, the so-called Monarchianists taught that there was only One Person in God." (Ludwig Ott., Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma, St. Louis, Missouri: B. Herder Book Co. 1957, p. 101). The Alexandrian Presbyter Arius" taught that the Son of God did not exist from eternity but was "a creature of the Father, produced by Him from nothing before all other creatures". (Ibid., p.51). Thus, the Arian heresy taught that the Son of God "is not, in the proper and true sense, God, but only in the improper sense, insofar as He, in anticipation of His merits, was adopted by the Father as Son". (Ibid. p.51).

In the year 325, the "First General Council at Nicaea" in opposition to and in condemnation of this heresy, "drafted a creed which confesses Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, His generation from the substance of the Father, His true Divinity and His consubstantiality with the Father". (Ibid. p.51). The semi-Arians followed, and so on down the line.

ence of the liberal theology, modernism) (which was brilliantly and irrefutably condemned by Pope St. Pius X in his Encyclical, Pascendi, 1907) also denies the Divinity of Christ" (Ibid. p.128).

Now, with such a history of heresies which sought to undermine the doctrine of the Trinity, one would think that even vague ambiguities would be totally avoided in any statements regarding the Divinity of the Three Persons in God; the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. In the Traditional Mass such, of course, is the case. But, in the "New Mass" in English (and in most other vernaculars) there is not only ambiguity but there is actually a literal statement and proclamation of the heresy which attributes Divinity to the Father alone.

Of course, when this is pointed out to so-called "conservative" clerics, they defend the literal heresy by saying that it is not really intended and, since they believe in the Divinity of the Three Persons in God, they are not embracing any heretical notions. This, of course, is a rationalisation, and, generally speaking, it is most probably rooted in cowardice rather than blindness.

Many clerics protect their ignorance because of the fear of what investigation might uncover. But, when ignorance is deliberately fostered "as a means of being excused from sin or of not avoiding some sin" (Dominic M. Prammer, O.P. Handbook of Moral Theology, Cork; The Mercier Press, 1956, p.10), it does not diminish "the voluntariness of an act and its sinfulness". (Heribert Jone, op. cit. p.17). So there is really no excuse for many of the good, conservative priests who just go along and who justify themselves by a false notion of obedience.

As Catholics here is what we must believe:

We believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ is the Son of God, He is God and Man. He is God begotten of the substance of the Father before all ages and Man born in time of the substance of His Mother. (Ott. op. cit., p.127).

And concerning the Trinity:

The doctrinal decisions of the Church are: in God there are Three Persons, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Each of these Three Persons possesses the One (numerical) Divine essence. (Ibid., p.52).

Now examine, in the light of the historical attack on the Blessed Trinity and the above statements of what faithful Catholics believe, what the "New Mass" being used in the churches throughout India and the world says about who possesses the "Divine essence". Here is what is stated in Eucharistic Prayer IV of the "New Mass": "Father in Heaven, it is right that we should give You thanks and glory: You alone are God, living and true."

The key word is "alone". If it were left out, the subverters would have been able to get away with the obvious attempt to emphasize the Divinity of the Father to the exclusion of the Son and the Holy Ghost. On the other hand, compare the above with the Sunday Preface in the Traditional Mass:

"It is truly meet and just, right and profitable unto salvation that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto Thee, O Holy Lord, Father Almighty, everlasting God, Who, with the only begotten Son and the Holy Ghost, art One God, One Lord: not in the oneness of a single person, but in the Trinity of One substance."

The use of the word "alone" in Eucharistic Prayer IV of the "New Mass" excludes the Son and the Holy Ghost from the Godhead and attributes Divinity exclusively to the Father. In Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 2nd Edition, the definition of the word "alone" is quite clear in meaning: (1) Apart from others; all by oneself; solitary. (2) Exclusive of others; without anyone or anything else; only, etc. Therefore,

V

My letter of 1.11.82 was not answered by  
the Archbishop so, I mailed the undelivered  
open letter to several Senior Priests in  
India. None of them replied.

Dr. C. B. Andrade,  
10/3 Benson Cross Road,  
Bangalore 560 046.  
~~21/11/82~~. 6.1.83

Dear Reader,

I attach for your perusal copies of correspondence I have exchanged with the Archbishop of Bangalore, my last letter being dated 1-11-'82. As I have not received an answer from him to this letter, I am forced to one or other of the following conclusions: (1) that my arguments are unanswerable because I am one hundred per cent correct in what I have said, or (2) that the Archbishop is either too ignorant, indolent or indifferent to his duty as Pastor of souls to furnish me with a reply. I have, therefore, decided to make the matter public in the hope that someone - Pope, Cardinal, Archbishop, Bishop, priest or layman - will provide me with a rational answer (supported by the traditional teaching of the Church) which, if still not forthcoming, will serve further to confirm the fact that my arguments are unanswerable and that this so-called "new mass" is, indeed, heretical and invalid. And, since it is heretical and invalid, what is your excuse for celebrating it, not merely on Sundays, but daily? And, if you celebrate or participate in a heretical service, are you not a heretic yourself?

C. B. Andrade  
C. B. Andrade.

This is a "follow-up" letter to the same Latin friends to whom I mailed my open letter of 6.1.83. My reply was received to this letter also

Dr. C. B. Andrade,  
10/5 Benson Cross Road,  
Bangalore 560 046.

20.1.83.

Dear Reader,

With my letter of 6-1-1983 I enclosed copies of correspondence I had exchanged with the Archbishop of Bangalore including an article entitled "The 'New Mass' Violates the First Commandment of God" and proving that it was heretical.

or

In this letter, I would like to expand on the Arian heresy contained in Eucharistic Prayer IV and its logical consequences.

As I have clearly demonstrated in the above-mentioned article you could not find the Arian heresy (i.e. denial of Christ's divinity) more clearly expressed than in the preface of Eucharistic Prayer IV. Suppose, impossibly, that the "form" (of consecration) took effect in the Eucharistic Prayer IV which (to repeat) denies Christ's divinity. Have we then on the table (there is no sacrificial altar in the Novus Ordo) the infinitely valuable Divine Christ or a mere man - a human sacrifice - of no value whatsoever? Is it not even less - the useless corpse of the greatest liar and imposter of all time: the man who deluded nineteen centuries into believing he is God? And, supposing anyone can really accept and believe this "consecration", when this corpse of a mere man is elevated and adored, is this not IDOLATRY?

What must be said of the man, the "pope" and his equally bogus successors who foisted this atrocity on us? Can you pretend to believe him (or them) Catholic? Can you insist on his (or their) papal prerogative or authority? Can you postulate that even these could cover such a crime? Is not obedience to condemned heresy in action in itself condemnation of, support of and participation in heresy? So where does this leave you and the so-called "people of God" whom you have bamboozled and led into heresy and idolatry?

~~St. Pietro da Veroli, the eminent 16th century theologian says:~~  
"No temporisation can be tolerated where there is a danger to the faith, especially when it is as proximate and grave as that presented by a Pontiff who supports heresy, even only in private. In such a case, why wait until redress comes from a General Council, the calling of which is not easy? Is it not, fortunately, true to say that, faced with such a danger to the faith, any subordinate at all may, by virtue of the principle of fraternal correction, warn his superior, oppose him openly, refute him and, if necessary, challenge him and put pressure on him to repent (emphasis added)

"St. Paul's words to Titus (3-10-11) are valid for every individual even private persons: 'A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, avoid: knowing that he that is such a one, is subverted and sinneth, being condemned by his own judgement' (emphasis added) Therefore, any person who, after one or two warnings, does not mend his ways and remains stubbornly attached to his private judgement contrary to certain and defined doctrines - and, because of his obstinacy, such a person cannot avoid the accusation of some definite heresy which his pertinacity reveals - then he has declared himself to be a manifest heretic. He has shown that he has withdrawn from the Catholic faith and from the Church, in such a way that there is no need for any further declaration or sentence by any authority whatever to cut him off from the body of the Church".

at all may --- warn his superior --- and challenge him" and as St. Paul's words to Titus are valid even for private persons, having called your attention to your heresy and admonished you in my letter of 8-1-1983, I hereby again admonish you, and the Archbishop of Bangalore in particular, to mend your ways for if you remain stubbornly attached to your private judgement "contrary to certain and defined doctrine" then you have declared yourself to be a manifest heretic and that you have withdrawn from the Catholic faith and the Church in such a way that there is no need for any further declaration or sentence by any authority whatever to cut you off from the body of the Church.

I mention admonishing and having admonished you, but this is not necessary to label you a heretic. Hiding behind a misapplication of

- 2 -

canon 2315 some have argued that Vatican II popes, bishops and priests have not been warned by the Church and, therefore, cannot be labeled heretics. But the Church has warned the faithful over the centuries in unmistakable words officially pronounced by pope after pope, council after council. Their entire theological course has warned these conciliar prelates and priests off heresy and instilled correct doctrine into them. All history has warned them. Since Vatican II, moreover, they have been subjected to a massive literature from traditionalist bishops, priests, laymen and even non-Catholics, but have obstinately and bloody-mindedly refused to advert to the points and issues raised.

No, there is no need for any admonition from the Church or from anybody else to declare the whole horde of conciliar hierarchy and clergy, heretics.

C. B. Andrade  
C. B. Andrade.

111