

Orthodoxy

Table of Contents

1. “The Arians of the 20th Century”, 1990, *Challenge*
2. “‘Why you Can Disagree and Remain a Faithful Catholic’ by Philips S – Kaufman”, Book review, 1991
3. “An Introduction to *Veritatis Splendor*”, 1994
4. “Notes on Gregory Baum – ‘By their Fruits You Shall Know them’”, 1996
5. “Novalis, Kung and Truth”, 2006, *Catholic Insight*
6. “Answering the Call to Holiness”, November, 2001
7. “On Gregory Baum”, *Lifesitenews*, 2012
8. “Teilhard de Chardin: Arch-Heretic”, *Catholic Insight*, 2013

1. Arians of the Twentieth Century

Arianism, the fourth century heresy which nearly destroyed the Church, denied the divinity of Christ. This heresy, in subtler forms and in many guises, was widespread in the last century and persists today. At the request of Larry Henderson I wrote this article for Challenge magazine in 1990. Space limitations required the deletion of a part of it. It was reprinted in the January-February 1992 issue of the English periodical "The Keys of Peter". Here is the full text. –Msgr. Vincent Foy

For years, the “progressives” have been telling us that they are getting the Church ready for the 21st century. So far, the results have been less than reassuring. Is it possible that, instead of progressing they have actually restored an ancient heresy? Msgr. Vincent Foy, a Canadian canonist, believes so.

The inscription on the coat of arms of Archbishop Ambrozic of Toronto reads: “Jesus est Dominus.” Here “Dominus” or Lord is used to translate the Hebrew Yahweh, sacred word for God. So we have in the motto a glorious acclamation of the divinity of Christ.

Pope John Paul II began his first encyclical “Redemptor Hominis” with the words: “The Redeemer of Man, Jesus Christ, is the centre of the universe and of history.” He is Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End, Lord of Lords, King of Kings, the Way, the Truth and the Life.

All of these titles presuppose Christ’s divinity. Possessing two natures, the human and the divine, there is in Christ one Person. In Him there is a total substitution of human personality by the Personality of the Word, the second Person of the Blessed Trinity. This marvel and mystery of the supernatural order is called the Incarnation or Hypostatic Union. The Church expresses it in this way in the Nicene Creed: “We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, eternally begotten of the Father God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not made, one in Being with the Father. Through Him all things were made.”

Certain truths flow from Christ’s divinity: All that He taught was divine. All that He did was divine. The Church He founded is divine. The structure and powers He gave His Church are of divine origin.

From Apostolic times there have been attacks on Christ’s divinity, His word, and His Church. The most harmful attack was instituted by an Alexandrian priest called Arius in the fourth century. It nearly destroyed the indestructible Church. St. Jerome wrote in exaggerated language: “The whole world sighed as it awoke in wonder to find itself Arian.” The classical account of that frightful heresy is told by Cardinal Newman in *Arians of the Fourth Century*. It is supplemented by his *Causes of the Rise and Successes of Arianism* in “*Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical*”.

There is today, in subtler form, perhaps as grave a threat to the Church as existed in the fourth century. It is also an attack on the Divinity of Christ or His Word or Church. It is possible here

only to glance at the problem of the Arians of the Twentieth Century. We look backwards briefly in order to look more clearly at the present.

The Arians of the fourth century

Arianism, named after Arius is, put simply, the denial of the divinity of Christ. Arius taught that the Word, the term used by St. John to designate the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, or God the Son, is not equal to the Father. In Arianism Christ is a creature more perfect than others used by God in His subsequent acts of creation. For a more technical description of Arianism see the excellent article in the old Catholic Encyclopedia, or the concise description in *The Catholic Catechism* by Fr. John A. Hardon, S.J. (Doubleday).

Arius (c.256-336) was a priest of the Diocese of Alexandria, then the most important See in the Church after Rome. Persuasive and charismatic, he was a popular preacher with a large following. He was a follower rather than an originator, led into error by his teacher Lucian of the school of Antioch.

For refusing to retract his errors, Arius was excommunicated by Alexander his Bishop in 319 or 320. He went to Asia Minor where he was supported by Bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia, also a pupil of Lucian. At the Council of Nicea in 325 Arius was permitted to defend his position but was condemned and exiled. In 335 the emperor Constantius decreed that Arius was to be reconciled with the Church by the Bishop of Constantinople. This was arranged in 336 but the night before the planned ceremony Arius unexpectedly died.

St. Athanasius (c.296-373) is a Father and Doctor of the Church. Even in his own time he was called “the Father of Orthodoxy”.

Also of the Diocese of Alexandria, Athanasius was ordained a deacon in 318 and appointed secretary to Bishop Alexander. Many, including Cardinal Newman, are of the opinion that he wrote the text of the excommunication of Arius.

As secretary to Alexander, Athanasius was at the first ecumenical council at Nicea in 325, which gave us the Nicene Creed. Shortly after, Alexander died and Athanasius became Bishop of Alexandria when he was not yet thirty. In the ensuing struggle between Arians and Catholics Athanasius was exiled five times and spent more than seventeen years in banishment.

Cardinal Newman wrote that St. Athanasius was “a principal instrument after the Apostles by which the sacred truths of Christianity have been conveyed and secured to the world”.

From the time he was a Deacon until his death, the life of Athanasius was a heroic struggle for the Traditional Faith of the Church in the divinity of Christ. This fidelity to tradition permeates all his writings. “What Fathers can you assign to your phrases?” was his challenge to the Arians.

After Nicea the Arians often adopted the terminology of the Council yet interpreted it in a way which denied Christ’s divinity. It was this semi-Arianism which nearly destroyed the Eastern

Church. Of the semi-Arians Athanasius wrote: “Unwilling that the decrees of the Council should be enforced they desire to enforce their own decisions; and they use the name of the Council”.

Suffering set-back after set-back Athanasius, always loyal to the primacy of Rome, never lost courage. Although the victory over Arianism is principally due to him, it was not yet won when he died.

Of the Church of that time St. Basil wrote: “The dogmas of the Fathers are despised; apostolic traditions are set at naught; the discoveries of innovators hold sway in the Church. Men have learned to be speculatists instead of theologians. The wisdom of the world has the place of honor, having dispossessed the glory of the Cross . . . the aged sorrow comparing what is with what was; more pitiable the young, as not knowing what they are deprived of.” (quoted from Newman’s *Historical Sketches*, Vol. II, “The Church of the Fathers,” Westminster, 1970, p. 43).

Is there not some similarity with the Church of today?

Arianism today

There is, as we shall see, a new Arianism abroad today.

There are some similarities with the Arianism of the fourth century.

Neither past nor present forms originated with the laity. In general they have had their origins with theologians. Both pretended to be an updating of the Church in the light of new insights. Both were attacks on tradition. Both enlisted Bishops in their causes. In the fourth century whole synods of Bishops were won over to Arianism; today some National Hierarchies have taken positions which indirectly favour it. Both have tried and succeeded in getting advocates in positions of power. In both periods the “spirit” of an Ecumenical Council was invoked in support of error.

There is this significant difference. In the fourth century Arianism originated from within the Church. Today’s has come principally from outside influences.

An Arian atmosphere around and finally penetrating the Church has developed in over 200 years. In the eighteenth century the rejection of Christ’s divinity permeated the Enlightenment in England, the Encyclopedists in France and a similar group in Germany. In more recent times Christ’s divinity has been attacked by many others, including Adolph von Harnack (1851-1930) Head of the School of Theology, University of Berlin. He had four influential pupils: Paul Tillich, who called worship of Christ a form of idolatry; Rudolph Bultmann, called the father of de-mytholization; Albert Schweitzer, who rejected Christ as God; Dietrich Bonhoeffer, hanged by the Nazis in 1945, who saw Christ as merely “the man for others”. Many Catholic scholars have come under their spell.

As we survey the havoc an Arian atmosphere has brought in the Church, we note three principal forms:

- First, direct attacks on Christ's divinity.
- Second, indirect attacks by rejecting doctrines which support it.
- Third, attacks on the divinity of the Church in its origin and essential structure.

Arian Scripture scholars

Arius divorced Scriptural passages like "The Father is greater than I" from the living tradition of the Church in an attempt to prove that Christ was not divine. Athanasius linked Scripture with tradition to show Christ's divinity. (cf. Newman, *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians*, 2 Vols., Longman's, Green & Co., 1888).

Some modern Bible exegetes turn God's word against the Word of God by isolating their methodology from tradition and sometimes give us an Arian Christ. This is done by adhering as to an absolute to what is called the "historico-critical method". This method considers the sacred text like any other record. It assumes the role of critic and continually looks for signs of alterations, additions and contemporary proofs.

The historico-critical method falters when based on wrong philosophical presumptions, prejudice and unsupported hypotheses. It falls when divorced from the living Church.

Here are some examples:

1. Fr. John L. McKenzie S.J., denies the possibility of the Virgin Birth because it seems to him that Jesus would not be fully human if he were not generated by a human father. (cf. *New Testament Without Illusion*, New York, 1982, p. 110 ff.).
2. Fr. Raymond Brown, following the historico-critical method, concludes that the stories of Christ's birth are dubious history, his twelve Apostles were neither missionaries nor bishops; sacramental powers were given to the *Christian Community* in the person of the Twelve; the episcopate gradually emerged but can be defended as divinely established by Christ only if one says it emerged with the guidance of the Holy Spirit; Peter cannot be looked upon as the bishop of the early Roman Church community; Vatican II was biblically naïve when it called Catholic bishops successors to the Apostles (cf. Msgr. George Kelly, *The Church's Problem with Bible Scholars*, Franciscan Herald Press, 1985, pp.27, 28).
3. Fr. Ronald Lawler, O.F.M. Cap. says: "Fr. Brown treats the Church like a missing person . . . the Church created Scripture and her assistance is always necessary in reading Scripture". (Newsletter , *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars*, March, 1985, p.14).
4. Scripture scholars at their Arian worst are seen at meetings like the *Jesus Seminar* held at Toronto in October, 1989. Conclusions about Jesus were reached by a majority vote of the approximately 120 Catholic and non-Catholic scholars who attended. They were described as "some of the foremost biblical scholars in Canada, the United States and Europe".

Here are two conclusions passed by the Jesus Seminar: “Christ never promised to usher in a new age and people should not look forward to a Second Coming.”; “Christ did not regard himself as divine, never intended to found a religion and would have been appalled at becoming a cult figure.”

Cardinal Ratzinger has commented that the Bible not understood within the living organism of the Church becomes archaeology. He says that the last word about the Word of God belongs to the Magisterium. The historic-critical method becomes sterile when made absolute. (cf. *The Ratzinger Report*, Ignatius Press, 1985, pp.73-76).

Unfortunately, the erroneous “findings” of Scripture scholars have been a seed-bed for writers of popular books of Christ, e.g. Gerard Sloyan’s blurred *Jesus in Focus*.

Theological Arianism

Out of the crucible of errant biblical criticism has come a host of theological errors many of which directly or indirectly attack Christ’s divinity.

Modernism

Modernism, the attempt to accommodate Church teaching to modern philosophies and concepts, was potentially the most dangerous of all heresies. It flourished in the first decade of this century. Pope Pius X called it the “cross-roads of all heresies”.

The leading figures of Modernism were Loisy in France and Tyrell in England. In the background was Baron Friedrich von Hugel. Others were Murri and Fogazzaro in Italy and Schell in Germany.

The most dangerous aspect of Modernism was the way in which it undermined belief in the divinity of Christ. A precursor of Modernism was Renan (1823-1892). He boasted of his book *Life of Jesus*, that in it he “forced Jesus to resign his divinity”. Loisy (1857-1940) influenced by Renan, gradually lost his faith in Jesus as God. He denied the Virgin Birth, the bodily resurrection of Christ, and Christ’s institution of Baptism and the Eucharist. While his friend Baron von Hugel was defending him, Loisy wrote in his journal: “Setting aside metaphysical phraseology, I do not believe in the divinity of Jesus any more than Harnack . . . and I look on the personal Incarnation of God as a philosophic myth.”

Modernism was condemned by Pope Pius X in two principal documents: the decree *Lamentabili* of July 2, 1907, and the encyclical *Pascendi* of September 8, 1907.

Neo-Modernism

Many of the errors of Modernism lie heavily on the Church today through the pretence that it was a bogey invented by the Vatican. In the March, 1990 issue of *Compass* magazine, Fr. Roger Haight, S.J., professor of systematic theology at Regis College, Toronto, tells us “In condemning

Modernism in 1907 the Vatican created the heresy it was denouncing.” The errors condemned in *Lamentabili* were taken almost completely from the writings of Loisy and Tyrell. Father Haight continues: “It is difficult to find anything in the thought of the leading modernists that is seriously objectionable or that is not held, perhaps in modified form, today.” It is true that many Modernist errors are held today. It is not true to say that it is difficult to find errors in the thought of the leading modernists unless it is legitimate to attack the foundations of Christianity.

These are some of those foundations attacked by the Neo-Modernists:

1. *The Bodily Resurrection of Christ* – Often the certainty of Faith gives way to the uncertainty of the theologian. Example “The story of the women finding Jesus’ tomb to be open and empty (Mk.16, 1-8, and parallels) seem unique to Christianity. But is the story reliable? Here it does no harm to recall that very many critical exegetes and historians defend the empty tomb story. There is a reasonable case to be made for their conclusion”. (Gerald O’Collins, S.J., under “Resurrection of Christ,” *The New Dictionary of Theology*, Glazier, 1989).

2. *Miracles* – Miracles are an integral part of the proof of Christ’s divinity. Christ said: “The works I do in my Father’s name are my witness; but you do not believe” (Jn.10, 23). Neither do some neo-modernists. “Although the New Testament provides ample proof that the earliest Christians believed certain events had occurred, some of which were miraculous, it is a further question whether Christians today should or can agree. Perhaps the N.T. authors wrote as they did because they were deceived or deceitful; that has always been a possible argument and some have thought it the most likely one”. (Charles C. Hefling, under “Miracles”. *The New Dictionary of Theology*, p.662).

3. *Original Sin* – Attacking the doctrine of original sin is an attack on the need for universal redemption and indirectly on Christ’s divinity. A typical approach is to belittle the concept that original sin is inherited. We are told of the “crude essentialism of the traditional concept of a sinful nature inherited by generation from a sinful ancestor and meriting eternal sanction”. (ibid., Gabriel Daly, O.S.A., under “Original Sin”). It is of Faith that original sin is transmitted by natural generation: “by propagation, not imitation it is transmitted to all”. (Denzinger, 970).

“New Theology” Arianism

The “New Theology” proposed by some recent writers is often a re-hash of old errors, often with an Arian taint.

Piet Schoonenberg, in his book *The Christ*, translated into English in 1972, gives us a God who is subject to change and transmutes into a Trinity at the time of the Incarnation.

Bruce Vawter, in *This Man Jesus*, 1974, follows in the path of Schoonenberg. He accepts an Adoptional Christology, i.e., Christ merited by His death to become the adopted Son of God. Hans Kung, in *On Being a Christian*, 1974, affirms that Christ is not truly divine. According to Kung, Christ was not virginally conceived nor did he really rise from the dead.

Edward Schillebeeckx, in *Jesus: An Experiment in Christology*, 1974, and *The Christian*

Experience in the Modern World, proposed a Christ, not virginally conceived, who has a special intimacy with God.

Liberation Theology

The Christ of erroneous liberation theology, e.g. of Gutierrez, Boff, Sobrino and others is a Marxist-type revolutionary, an Arian Christ.

The organization *World Development and Peace*, to which so many Catholics contribute, has often been on the side of erroneous liberation theology. Nor does it pretend to put evangelization first in its distribution of aid (cf. *Development and Peace*, Young Canadians for a Christian Civilization, Montreal, 1982). Some years ago in its campaign literature, it circulated a picture of “Jesus Christ – Liberator” with this comment, borrowed from the United Church poster: “The image of Jesus Christ as liberator is one that sums up all helpful images. Here is the Christ who liberates one for living. This laughing, robust Christ reinforces all the true things about justice and love and divine presence. This Christ says to us that we shouldn’t take our ideas, our beliefs – too seriously. Life is too big and existence is too mysterious for any of us to be so deadly certain.” My objection to the poster went unanswered.

True World Development and Peace will come through its conversion to Christ. Would it not be better to place the funds now given to *World Development and Peace* in the hands of an organization like *Aid to the Church in Need*? It makes orthodoxy a test for its help and evangelization its first aim.

Theological Pluralism

A certain way to loss of faith in Christ’s divinity is through acceptance of theologies not in harmony with Catholic tradition.

Here is the kind of theological reduction leading some astray today: “We should recognize that Lutherans and Anglicans have valid orders and, therefore, the real presence of the body and blood of Christ – a strong case exists for the real presence of Christ in eucharistic celebrations of Churches with no claim to a tactile succession – a united Church of the future should be democratic and will have to be a community of very diverse Churches”. (Fr. Philip Kaufman, O.S.B., *Why You Can Disagree and Remain a Faithful Catholic*. Myer Stone Books, 1989 pp.158, 159, 161). St. Hilary, “The Athanasius of the West,” wrote in the fourth century: “We are falling away from the Faith which is always one and the same: for when faith begins to be several, *plures*, they are entering in the path which will end with no faith at all.” (PL.10, 566).

Episcopal Arianism

We have bishops by Christ’s will and institution and by them Christ’s revelation is preserved and the Mass continued. Who can measure the gratitude we owe them: Shepherds, Confessors, sometimes Martyrs.

There is no question here of Arian Bishops for I know of none who would follow Bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia rather than Bishop Athanasius of Alexandria.

Yet indirectly fostering Arianism are bishops who permit in their seminaries, colleges and schools, teachings and texts which undermine or question the divinity of Christ. We have seen how this is done.

Indirectly promoting Arianism are Bishops who fail to uphold what the Church teaches with the authority of Christ. Consider the Great Tragedy of 1968. Speaking in the name of the Church and invoking the authority of Christ, the Holy Father reaffirmed the Church's constant prohibition of artificial contraception, direct sterilization and abortion. Yet, rejecting the prohibition of artificial contraception as a moral absolute the hierarchies of Canada, Austria, West Germany, the Netherlands and seven other countries mitigated the Church's teaching.

Focusing on Canada we see a progressive deterioration in family life. While Bishops keep silent countless thousands of persons created in God's image are killed by Catholic Hospital personnel through the prescription of abortifacient pills and devices. Countless thousands of others would have been but are not because of contraceptive sterilizations performed in Catholic Hospitals.

Ecclesial Arianism

The Church of Christ is the Roman Catholic Church

Indirectly Arian is the error which denies that the Church of Christ and Roman Catholic Church are identical terms. In the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Vatican II we read: "this Church (of Christ) constituted and organized as a society in the present world, subsists in the Catholic Church". The word "subsists" has been wrongly used to mean that Christ's Church and the Catholic Church are not identical. Bishop Clemente Ruffini of Rome is reported to have said that the Church did not receive the mission from Christ to spread a sole Gospel throughout the world but rather the mission of promoting the differences and multiplicity of religions, all of which make manifest, each in its own way, the same Word (cf. *30 Days*, April, 1990, p.79).

In *The Catholic Catechism* Fr. John Hardon, S.J. says: "Behind the carefully chosen verb 'subsists' stands the affirmation that the objective fullness of Christ's heritage to the Church – totality of his revelation, totality of his sacraments, and totality of authority to rule the people of God in his name – resides in the Catholic Church of which the Bishop of Rome is the visible head". (Doubleday & Co., 1975, p.213). I suggest a reading of the first section of "Mysterium Ecclesiae" on "The oneness of Christ's Church". (Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, June 24, 1973). Although Avery Dulles objects, the draft text of the new Universal Catechism reads simply: "The Church of Christ exists in the Catholic Church". (cf. *30 Days*, May 1990, p.12).

The Structure of Christ's Church

Obliquely Arian is the call for changes in the structure of the Church as it was established by

Christ. In Christ's Church the Pope has "full, supreme and universal power over the whole Church, a power which he can always exercise unhindered". (*Lumen Gentium*, 22). The divinely ordered structure of the Church includes the Bishops, "together with their head, the Supreme Pontiff, and never apart from him" (ibid.).

Contemporary attempts to violate the divinely established structure of his Church abound:

1. At the *Chicago Call to Action* meeting (Feb. 3,4, 1990) there were strident calls for a restructuring of the Church.
2. A similar call appeared in a full-page advertisement in the New York Times of Feb. 18, 1990, signed by 4505 Concerned Catholics.
3. Closer to home but with the same warped notion of ecclesiology is the CCCC (*Coalition of Concerned Canadian Catholics*). This group wishes to "transform present Church structures". Mary Malone, Associate professor of religious studies at St. Jerome's College, Waterloo, Ontario, has said: "The clergy have as much power as we lay people have given them and we have given them too much." At a Conference of the CCCC Joanna Manning of the Toronto Metro School Board expressed fear of the Conservative trend with its "stress on orthodoxy".
4. In the often neo-modernist *The New Dictionary of Theology*, under "Pope" we read "The Pope is the spiritual head within the community of Christians ministering in accordance with the fundamental affirmation of the faith of that community" (p.782). Under *Church* by Edmund Hill, O.P., we read that the laity has a divinely given constitutional right to say on the formulation of Christian doctrine. (p.200).
5. In the book already quoted, *Why You Can Disagree and Remain a Faithful Catholic*, Fr. Philip S. Kaufman, O.S.B., says: "The People of God should be a primary source, a *locus theologicus* of 'What the Spirit is saying' to the Church. Structures of constitutional democracy are best suited to make that source available to leaders in the Church".
6. In Canada a false ecclesiology has been fostered by the Pastoral Team of the Canadian Catholic Conference of Bishops (CCCCB). This team takes responsibility for the working paper, *Marriage and the Family*, 1980. There we read: "There are some who continue to stress the clerical character of the Church. They view the Church as authority vested in pastor, bishop, Pope. *Lumen Gentium* (Vatican II) stresses, in the first place, the People of God and then the hierarchical and sacramental dimensions. It emphasizes that the ecclesial structures should rest on the three poles of collegiality: episcopal, presbyteral and lay". (p.157). It does no such thing. Collegiality in Vatican II refers to the Holy Father and the Bishops united with him. Collegial power and authority are that of the Pope and Bishops together (cf. *Dictionary of the Council*, Corpus Books, p.95). The Church cannot renounce the structure given her by Christ.

Here is the true ecclesiology: "By divine institution it is the exclusive task of these pastors alone, the successors of Peter and the other Apostles, to teach the faithful authentically, that is with the authority of Christ shared in different ways; so that the faithful, who are not free simply to listen to them as experts in Catholic doctrine, are bound to accept their teaching given in Christ's

name, with an assent that is proportionate to the authority that they possess and that they mean to exercise". (*Mysterium Ecclesiae*, 2).

Liturgical Arianism

We sometimes forget that the liturgy, the public prayer of the Church, is also the prayer of Christ. "There is nothing better here below than prayer, and the best prayer is evidently that of the Church, since it is the inflatable prayer of Christ, continued and always active." (Pierre Charles, S.J. *Prayer For All Times*, Vol. II, London Sands & Co., 1929, p.48). To ignore or violate liturgical law is to empty it of Christ.

"It belongs to the Church's authority to regulate the sacred liturgy. Nobody therefore is allowed to proceed on his own initiative in this domain." (Instruction on the *Proper Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, Sept. 26, 1964, para.20).

What happens when liturgical law is violated?

Instead of the Church acting in God's name an individual is acting in his own name.

Worship of God is replaced by pride of self.

Service is replaced by disobedience, scandal replaces edification and the custodian turns destroyer.

An act of love is replaced by a profound breach of charity, and the illicit ceremony is emptied of Christ.

The Eucharist, containing Christ, Redeemer and Bread of Life, is the apex of liturgical worship. "Let us be under no illusion. There is no charity possible as an institution, as a thing that is a world-power, outside the Sacrament of Christ's mystical Body." (Dom Anscar Vonier, O.S.B., *A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, Newman Press, 1925, p.257). Pope John Paul II has emphasized the essential link between the Eucharist and the Church's spiritual and apostolic vitality. (*Dominicae Cenaes*, Feb.24, 1980, Para.4).

To ignore a person is to treat him or her as nothing. Surely to ignore Christ present in the Eucharist is to treat Him as less than divine. This is done in myriad ways. Some of these ways are independent of the choice of the laity: the virtual abolition of Benediction, Holy Hours, Forty Hours Devotions, Processions of the Blessed Sacrament, the tabernacle placed in a less than focal position. Other ways come from the faithful: failure to genuflect, gossip in Church, levity and vulgarity in giving the kiss of peace, failure to make a sign of adoration on the reception of Holy Communion, neglect to make a suitable thanksgiving – even the sacrilege of the reception of Christ's Body in grave sin.

Some of the disregard for the divinity of Christ in the Eucharist comes from theological errors – e.g. transignification and transfinalisation divorced from transubstantiation. These errors have been condemned. (*Mysterium Fidei*, II). "Nor is it right to put forward and to give expression in

practice to the view which maintains that Christ the Lord is no longer present in the consecrated hosts which are left when the sacrifice of the Mass is over.” (ibid.).

In other ways also is Christ disregarded in the Eucharist. Recently I had a distress call from a person assisting at a wedding Mass. The priest had allowed the couple to be married to bake the bread for the Eucharist. It was leavened bread and of sweet taste. Did they receive the Bread of Life on their wedding day?

We ought ever keep in mind that the Eucharist, which is Christ, is also the sign and cause of the unity of the Mystical Body of Christ. (cf. *Mysterium Fidei*, 70).

Catechetical Arianism

Since the sixties the teaching of religion has been in a crisis state. Pope Paul VI spoke of “the Catechetical crisis during the last few years” (Oct.29, 1977). Cardinal Ratzinger gives us this analysis: “Since theology can no longer transmit a common model of the faith, catechesis is also exposed to dismemberment and to constantly changing experiments” (*Ratzinger Report*, Ignatius Press, 1985, p.72). One result has been texts with impoverished doctrinal content, placing the emphasis on method or process. This relatively creedless approach “is constitutionally unable to raise up professing Catholics”. (Msgr. Eugene Kevane, *The Sacrament of the Eucharist in Our Time*, St. Paul Editions, 1978, p.92). Another result has been an attack on Christ’s divinity reflecting that of dissident Scripture scholars and theologians.

Catholics owe a debt of gratitude to *Catholics United for the Faith*. They have given us a series of expert critiques of catechetical texts, many written by their President, James Likoudis. Although there are now some excellent texts, he has shown how the majority are tainted with Arianism, e.g. Sadlier’s *God With Us Religion Program* (1982-1988); Sadlier’s *Coming to Faith* series (1988-1989 edition); Benziger’s *In Christ Jesus* texts, 1988; Silver, Burdett and Ginn’s *This is Our Faith* texts, 1988; Christian Brothers’ Publication *Jesus of History, Christ of Faith* (High School Text), 1982.

Catechetical texts have descended into an Arian phase in several ways:

The first way is by over-emphasis of Christ’s humanity. Cardinal Oddi, formerly Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Clergy, has given details of ways in which this has been done. (*The Right of the Catechized to the Truth*, St. Paul Editions, 1984, pp.24-25). Other examples: “The first important person whom the boy Jesus wondered about and learned about was God.” (Grade I, *This is Our Faith*, p.42); “As a human being Jesus did not know why good people suffer, why disasters strike, or why people die”. (Grade 8, *In Christ Jesus*, p.66).

One of the Modernist propositions condemned by Pope Pius X was “Christ did not always have the consciousness of His messianic dignity”. This error frequently surfaces in current texts. Example: “He must have spent a lot of time thinking about the kind of world in which He was living and what He was going to do about it”. (*God With Us*, Grade 8, p.80).

Essential to an understanding of Christ’s divinity and redemptive mission is an accurate

understanding of original sin. Original sin does not mean being born into a sinful world, yet we read: “Ever since (Adam and Eve sinned) people have been born into a world in which evil is very powerful. This condition is called ‘original sin’” (Grade 8, *In Christ Jesus*, p.155). In a review of the current Grade 8 text of the Canadian Catechism (1988 revision), Fr. Oliver Moloney notes: “The sacrament of Baptism removes the stain of original sin and confers sanctifying grace. The text should state this clearly. No direct reference is made to original sin in the text.”

Pope Pius X condemned the proposition that: “The Resurrection of the Saviour is not properly a fact of the historical order. It is a fact of merely the supernatural order (neither demonstrated nor demonstrable)”. Yet we read: “The gospel accounts are not attempts to record the Resurrection as a historical event but, rather, are proclamations or statements of faith about what had happened to Jesus”. (*Jesus of History, Christ of Faith*, p.166).

The source of current catechetical errors is evident. For example, the bibliography for *In Christ Jesus* gives us Monika Hellwig, ex-priest Carl Pfeifer, ex-priest Tad Guzie, ex-priest Gregory Baum, ex-Jesuit John L. McKenzie, Bernard Haring, and Charles E. Curran. *Coming to Faith* promotes as contemporary heroes and prophets Teilhard de Chardin and Martin Luther King Jr. Sources include Schillebeeckx and Monika Hellwig.

Countless parents grieve to see their children lose their Faith in Catholic schools. The crisis could be settled by insistence on the implementation of the General Catechetical Directory and the magnificent Apostolic Exhortation *Catechesi Tradendae* of Pope John Paul II.

New Age Arianism

What do we mean by New-Age? Randall Baer, a former New Age leader for many years, describes it as “a broad spectrum of non-Christian philosophies and practices that can be categorized as New Age Spiritual Humanism. The cornerstone of this humanism is the belief that man is divine in nature and is therefore essentially ‘God’ or an enlightened God-man.” (*Inside the New Age Nightmare*, Huntingdon House, 1989, p.84). The New Age Movement is so called because it is intended to bring about a new world order with one government and one religion (cf. Michelle Fleming, *New Age in the Light of Christian Teaching*, Life Ethics, p.2). New Age includes parapsychology, the occult, yoga, astrology, tarot-card reading and exotic therapies. New Age morality tolerates or embraces divorce, extramarital relations, homosexual practice, abortion and every other deviant practice of neo-paganism including sorcery and witchcraft.

New age denies any unique divinity to Christ. Yet in its perverse way it invokes the name of Christ as a kind of seductive talisman to lead New Agers away from Christ. In New Age Christ is not a Judge. Everyone is his own Judge. New Agers reject the personal and visible Second Coming of Christ. In its language, “Another Christ, Christ-consciousness, will lead the world into the New Age.” New Agers do not need a redeeming Christ, they redeem themselves.

Creation Spirituality

An off-shoot of the New Age movement which has weakened the centrality of Christ in the faith of hundreds of thousands of Catholics is called Creation Spirituality. The grand guru is Fr. Mathew Fox, O.P. He was silenced by the Holy See for a year because of his New Age theology and his support for Starhawk, a self-proclaimed witch and follower of the “earth religion” known as Wicca. The theology of Father Fox replaces Original Sin with “Original Blessing” and merges with a syncretic acceptance of non-Christian traditions. He calls for the rejection of forms of religion “based on fall-redemption theologies, structures and spiritualities”.

Another leader of creation-centered theology is Fr. Thomas Berry, author of *The Dream of the Earth*. (Sierra Book Club). He reflects Teilhardian Arianism when he writes: “Humans appear as the moment in which the unfolding universe becomes conscious of itself – We bear the universe in our being as the universe bears us in its being.”

In Canada, *Scarboro Missions*, the monthly magazine of the Scarboro Foreign Mission Society, which numbers many great missionary priests among its members, is more and more preoccupied with the secular – liberation theology, ecology – and Creation Spirituality. It is distressing to see the January 1990 issue devoted to the latter, featuring the Teilhardian-ridden *Creation Spirituality – A Necessity* by Sr. Anne Lonergan, R.C. In this way it is contributing to “the dimming of Christ.”

(Fr. Teilhard de Chardin believed Christ is evolving. Pope Pius XII called his writings “a cesspool of errors”.)

Arianism: Remedies

The first remedy is fidelity to the Church’s Creed.

In the second and third centuries the heresy of Gnosticism attacked the divinity of Christ. The Church weathered the storm by the faithful use of the baptismal Creed. It was the same fidelity to the Creed which achieved victory over Arianism. The Apostles’ Creed was developed into the Nicene-Constantinople Creed which in modified form we recite at Mass today. (cf. Msgr. Eugene Kevane, *Creed and Catechetics*, Christian Classics, 1978, p.31)

If we are to learn the lesson of history it is that all that promotes fidelity to the Creed, the precious revelation of Christ explained by the Church, must be preserved. We need a more careful use of the “Imprimatur,” apologetics back in our seminaries, homilies with doctrinal content, teachers living and loving their Faith, not “Call to Action”-type activists destroying it, texts faithful to the ancient Creeds and to the Credo of the People of God; and when it comes, adherence with gratitude to the *Universal Catechism*.

Next comes recognition of the authority of the Church as the authority of Christ. Cardinal Newman wrote: “It must be borne in mind that, as the essence of all religion is authority and obedience, so the distinction between natural religion and revealed religion lies in this. One has a subjective authority, the other an objective – the supremacy of Apostle, or Pope or Church or

Bishop is the essence of revealed religion.” (quoted from the *Tablet*, Dec. 2, 1967, p.1269). St. Thomas More saw the essential role of divine authority in the Church. Against Martin Luther he wrote: “Why is it not reasonable to believe certain truths only on the authority of the Church, since we accept the Gospels themselves on that same authority?” (from *An Answer to Martin Luther*). Pope Paul VI put it this way: “What would happen to unity of faith and of charity, if a concurrence of will, guaranteed by an authorized power, itself obedient to the superior will of God, did not propose and demand harmony of thought and action.” (*Obedience to the Church Essential*,” *L’Osservatore Romano*, Oct. 24, 1968, p.1).

Against the current heresy that authority and power in the Church are not from above but from the laity, Pope John Paul II has affirmed: “Authority of Bishops is not delegated by people.” (ibid., Feb. 26, 1990, p.1).

There is another side to authority and that is the obligation to assert authority to maintain the integrity of the Faith. “Nulla sanctio, nulla lex.” Where there is no sanction there is no law. Untold damage can be done when authority does not challenge error and take sufficient means to stop its spread. There is a lesson from Arianism. Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, because of an indulgent disposition took the “pastoral approach” and was slow to bring Arius to account. Cardinal Newman wrote: “The mischief which ensued from his misplaced meekness was considerable”.

Jesus Omega

Christ came that we should participate in His divine nature. St. Thomas says: “Since it was the will of God’s only-begotten Son that men should share in His divinity, he assumed our nature in order that by becoming man He might make men gods.” (Breviary reading, Feast of Corpus Christi).

Most do not know that Christ is their Omega, their destination. Although “The Church exists in order to evangelize” (John Paul II), of 5 billion people now on earth 3.5 billion do not recognize Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. It is not surprising that Cardinal Tomko, Prefect of the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples, speaks of a “missionary emergency”. (*L’Osservatore Romano*, 11 June, 1990, p.8).

We must work and pray for that unity of faith in Christ as Lord and Redeemer and that practice of our faith which is the foundation of evangelization. While we rightly reject every trace of Arianism around us we must also reject our personal Arianism, all that prevents us from making Christ the Lord of our lives.

So we pray with the Church:

“God our Father,
Your Word became man and was born of the Virgin Mary.
May we become more like Jesus Christ,
Whom we acknowledge as our redeemer,
God and man.” (Feast of the Annunciation)

St. Athanasius, Father of Orthodoxy, pray for us.

4. Notes on Gregory Baum

“By Their Fruits You Shall Know Them”

Foreword

It was a scandal to many Catholics that the arch-dissenter Gregory Baum was invited to speak at Regis College, Toronto, on January 17, 1996. The scandal was amplified when it was announced that he would also speak at the Newman Centre in Toronto on May 13, 1996. In an effort to prevent this I compiled the following notes on Gregory Baum. The effort was ineffective, though there was a demonstration of loyal Catholics outside of the Newman Centre protesting the appearance there of Baum. In my opinion Gregory Baum has done more than anyone else to weaken the Catholic Church in Canada, through false ecumenism, theological errors and his opposition to the encyclical “*Humanae Vitae*.”

Our oldest Toronto priest, Monsignor Ralph Egan, 95, spends his days in prayer and in sending Catholic prayer books and reading material to all parts of the world – free. He often quotes St. Anthony Mary Claret: “If you can’t send a missionary, send a book.” Of course he meant a good book. He is the founder of our Toronto St. Maximilian Kolbe group which distributes free Catholic literature. He understands the value of orthodox reading. He has told me that he keeps his strong faith through prayer – and by avoiding ever reading the dissenters or listening to dissent. He was quite aghast when I told him that Gregory Baum was going to speak at Regis College in Toronto on January 17. To honour the work of Msgr. Egan and in response to some requests I have compiled some notes on the teaching and conduct of Gregory Baum, marxist and “ex-priest”. In my opinion he has done more to help destroy the Church in Canada than any other person.

Communism and Marxism

He is commended in the Canadian Tribune (official communist publication) in 1963 for asking at an Anglican Congress “whether the ideals of Marx were not aims for which the Church should have worked.”

His name led a list welcoming Rabbi Feinburg (considered Canada’s leading Fellow Traveller) back from Hanoi in 1967.

Doctrine

In the “Christian Century” for April 6, 1966, p.429, he described how Catholic theologians could work together to change what had until now been considered immutable Church teaching.

In 1965, when Pope Paul VI reaffirmed the doctrine of transubstantiation in the encyclical “*Mysterium Fidei*,” Gregory Baum accused the Pope of stressing Trent as against Vatican II, of wishing to slow down the movement of renewal (The Canadian Register, Sept. 25, 1965).

Gregory Baum has repeatedly called for a “magisterium of the theologians.”

The Hierarchical Church

Gregory Baum has consistently attacked the Church teaching on the hierarchy and authority of Pope, Bishops and priests.

In a compendium of views on “The Future Church,” Gregory Baum said: “Bishops and popes will not be dressed as feudal lords. They will simply be brothers who have something to say. They will have authority because they express what their brethren really believe . . . In the future Christians will not look down on their fellow citizens who differ from them nor will they regard it as their duty to convert them.” (The Telegram, Toronto, July 1, 1967)

In 1970, at a World Congress on the Future of the Church, attended by about 800 theologians, most of them Catholics, Gregory Baum said: “Theologians must stop defining the Church’s teachings by looking at Scripture and tradition and then trying to apply what they find to the world . . . Catholics have learned to look at the Church as a Christian movement in which they participate on the terms defined by their own conscience . . . Father Baum said that one consequence of the new view that secular values are a source of theology is that people have learned to ‘de-mythologize’ the Church and the authority of the high officials.”

On November 24, 1995, Pope John Paul II insisted that “Catholic theologians may not openly dissent from Church teachings or propose ideas contrary to official doctrine. It seems necessary to recover the authentic concept of authority . . . theology can never be reduced to the ‘private’ reflection of a theologian or group of theologians. The vital atmosphere for theologians is the Church.”

Obedience to Authority

In the words of Msgr. George Kelly (“The Battle for the American Church,” p. 448,9): “Gregory Baum argued that Rome’s grip on the Church can be loosened by careful violation of law. In Baum’s view freedom from Rome’s law can be obtained by seizing it in the knowledge that violations will go unpunished. Baum points to the success of religious orders and Catholic universities standing up to Rome without suffering any sanction . . . the procedure of several American dioceses admitting Catholics in second marriages to Holy Communion receives Baum’s approval because no harm comes thereby to Church unity, with Rome only ‘mildly disapproving.’”

In the National Catholic Reporter for November 10, 1972, Gregory Baum wrote: “With courage and the right kind of discretion, bishops and local churches could deal with their problems even without total approval from the papal offices – without the slightest rupture with the Pope.”

Devotion to Mary

In the early sixties I attended a dinner at Osgoode Hall under the auspices of the Catholic Lawyers' Guild. Gregory Baum spoke on the exaggerated "cultus" of Mary in the Catholic Church. He said there was no evidence of devotion to Mary before the fourth century. At the time I had been reading a section of "Mariology" edited by Fr. Juniper Carol, O.F.M. on "The Origins and Cultus of Marian Cult." It gave numerous examples of devotion to Mary in the first three centuries. I was convinced that Fr. Baum was deliberately lying.

Contraception

The attack on the Church's teaching against artificial contraception has been at the core of the dissenters' attempts to destroy papal authority. "To repudiate the teaching on contraception . . . throws open the possibility of repudiating all of these other positions (divorce, sterilization, abortion, euthanasia) as well. The skein simply unwinds." (B.A. Santamaria). The Scottish Bishops, in their statement on "Humanae Vitae" said of the claim of dissenters that the papal decision (Humanae Vitae) did not demand assent: "Such an assertion is destructive of all that Catholics understand by the teaching authority of the Church."

In his attempts to undermine the authority of the Pope, Gregory Baum has concentrated on destroying the credibility of the Church's immemorial teaching against the practice of contraception. He is quite aware that in the measure in which he succeeds, the Church dies.

I point out here only a sampling of his attacks on God's law:

- In 1964 Gregory Baum contributed to a Herder and Herder book called "Contraception and Holiness," "a balanced and perceptive declaration of Christian dissent." Another contributor was Stanley Kutz, C.S.B., a Baum disciple, soon to leave the priesthood.
- In 1965 he joined 37 American Catholic scholars in signing a statement calling for a "qualified endorsement of contraception" and "a change in the Church's traditional position on birth-control."
- In 1966, in a feature article in the Toronto Globe and Mail he said, "Catholics May Use Contraceptives Now."
- In 1967 in an article in the Globe and Mail (April 23), after the majority opinions of the "Roman Catholic Birth Control Commission" had been leaked to the press, he said: "The publication of the texts will help many, many Catholics make up their own minds with a better conscience." He said, "Some of the bishops will be quite annoyed that they were not at all informed of these developments."
- In 1967 in the Toronto Star (May 6) he says that a liberalizing in his Church's attitude is inevitable not only in regard to birth control but to divorce and mixed marriages as well. He said Pius XI was pushed into writing "Casti Connubii" in 1930 by "Belgian

theologians” and “It is my personal conviction that Pius XI made a mistake and that in a very few years we will accept the teaching of the Anglican Bishops in 1930.”

- In 1968, after the encyclical “*Humanae Vitae*” was published, he said: “The Pope’s decisions went against the majority report of his own study commission, against the almost unanimous voice of the Lay Congress held in Rome last year, against the wishes of many bishops expressed at the recent meeting of the Synod, and against the weight of contemporary Catholic theology. The Pope rejected the Christian experience of vast numbers of Catholics and the witness of other Christian Churches . . . Catholics who cannot accept the papal teaching on birth control need not leave the Catholic Church. Nor do they become hypocrites by staying in the Church. If they have formed deep convictions on the morality of birth control, they may dissent from the official position and follow their own tested conscience.” (Globe and Mail, August 1, 1968).

The objections raised here against *Humanae Vitae* were precisely those given by some Bishops and “periti” at Winnipeg in the following month. If it had not been for the black shadow of Baum over Winnipeg, his influence over some Bishops, the Canadian theological establishment and pressure groups, the Winnipeg Statement of the Canadian Bishops on “*Humanae Vitae*” would not have refused to endorse the teaching of the encyclical as it did. It would have been an enthusiastic endorsement of the Church’s Charter of life and love, and the Church in Canada would not now be in a precipitous decline.

Conscience

Although he did not criticize the Winnipeg Statement of the Canadian Bishops in which their concept of conscience was open to criticism, when they did issue a Statement on Conscience which was in accord with Catholic doctrine he publicly criticized it. (December 1973).

On Human Sexuality

In the 1960’s, Gregory Baum was supportive and involved with a psychotherapy group with headquarters in three houses on Admiral Road in Toronto. A number of priests, nuns and Catholic students joined the group set up originally to explore alternatives to marriage. It gave great concern to Father John Kelly, President of St. Michael’s College. An article in The Telegram (Feb. 27, 1968) stated “Father Kelly continues to worry about the way promising priests, student priests and nuns join the group and begin to ease away from their religious duties.” More unsavoury details could be given.

When the “Declaration on Certain Questions Concerning Sexual Ethics” was issued by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on December 29, 1975, Gregory Baum criticized it severely. He said: “The concept of sex only within marriage was no longer adequate. Even if marriage is the ideal, this does not mean that there is no responsible context of sexual relations for mature single people, the widowed and the divorced.” In response, Archbishop Pocock declared: “Rev. Gregory Baum’s recently published reactions to a Vatican document on sexual conduct are contrary to official Catholic doctrine and may not be followed as either the

teaching or the practice of the Catholic Church.” Father Baum was suspended from hearing confessions.

Gregory Baum was a consultant with Charles E. Curran and Richard McCormick, S.J., on the book “Human Sexuality.” Among other things, it said: “The final word on mate swapping has not been said.” It claimed that there may occasionally arise exceptions to the prohibition of adultery, and “premarital intercourse may be justified if it represents a loving relationship and some measure of mutual commitment before sexual involvement.” This study was condemned by the American Bishops (Origins, June 9, 1977).

Scripture

Some insight into his rejection of Scripture as a basis for certainty or belief is given in a book: “The Credibility of the Church Today. A Reply to Charles Davis.” A review of the book says “One is driven to think it is so uncertain what Our Lord actually said and did, that the immense claims made for scripture as the touchstone for Christian Churches can hardly be maintained.” (Douglas Woodruff in Catholic Truth, Spring, 1969). One writer described the book by saying: “Fr. Baum’s reply to Davis seems to be much the same as Fr. Loisy’s to Harnack.” (John McKee in “The Enemy Within the Gate”, Lumen Christi Press, 1974, p.27).

He has repeatedly condemned the Catholic teaching on the inerrancy of Scripture.

The Priesthood

In conducting laicization cases of Toronto priests, I called Gregory Baum a witness only once. I realized that he promoted the concept of a temporary or “existential” priesthood – i.e., it may have been relevant yesterday but not necessarily today.

In the Daily Star of April 23, 1966, in an article entitled “Exodus,” Baum said he was not alarmed at the large numbers of priests and religious departing from their vocations. He said: “By assigning the laity a higher place in the Christian Church, the whole matter of the role of the clergy has to be re-thought.”

Status

In its issue of January 14, 1978, the Catholic Register reported that “Gregory Baum, noted Canadian theologian and outspoken critic of the Church, married a former nun in a private ceremony recently in Montreal . . . the bride is Shirley Flynn, who left her religious order about 15 years ago.” He had previously cancelled an application for laicization. According to Canon 2388 of the Code of Canon Law in force at that time, he was automatically excommunicated. I do not know his present status. He is not a Catholic theologian except by his own definition of the term. In 1980, when Hans Kung was declared not to be a Catholic theologian, a group of “60 American and Canadian Catholic theologians, including Baum, issued a declaration that they would continue to regard Kung as a Catholic theologian.”

Conclusion

The above notes are a superficial glance at some of the teachings and activities of Gregory Baum.

I have not touched on his errors in his books, in *Concilium*, his column in the *Catholic Register* in the sixties called “The Church To-Day”, the *Ecumenist*, *Compass*, *Commonweal*, the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* (in the sixties), *Catholic New Times*, of which he was a co-founder, and in his widely circulated tapes.

I have not examined his influence at Vatican II, his penetration of religious orders and communities, e.g., the Basilians and the Society of Jesus, his major role in the destruction of the Catholic Family Movement in Canada, his work through surrogates, his indirect influence on the Statements of the Canadian Bishops on contraception and divorce vs. civil law, his indirect influence on teaching at St. Augustine’s Seminary, his indirect influence on the Winnipeg Statement, his part in the decline of the Church in Quebec through his teaching, influence over some Quebec Bishops and support of theologians in their uprising against the encyclical “*Veritatis Splendor*.”

Nor have I considered his widespread influence through societies, groups, national and international congresses and protests of rebellious theologians. Cardinal Heenan had the good judgement to ban him from speaking at a Catechetical Convention in London.

In conclusion, the reason why I believe Gregory Baum should not have been permitted to occupy the Catholic podium at Regis College in Toronto on January 17, 1996, is that he consistently advocates immorality and teaches error.

These are the reasons why I believe Catholics should respectfully request our Archbishop not to permit Gregory Baum to speak at the Newman Centre in Toronto. A flyer is now widely circulating which reads: “Remembering Vatican II – Memories of the Council from one who was there – a lecture by Professor Gregory Baum, Peritus at the Council, Theologian, writer – Monday, May 13, 1996, 8:00 p.m., The Oak Room, of the Newman Centre of Toronto. The lecture is Free and Open to the Public.”

Those who wish to voice their concerns may write to:

The Newman Centre,
Roman Catholic Chaplaincy,
University of Toronto,
89 St. George Street,
Toronto, ON, M5S 2E8

Phone: 416-979-2468.

It would be a marvellous gift to the people of Canada if the CCCB were to set up a commission to study the influence of Gregory Baum on the Church.

We need all pray. In the words of a breviary intercession of to-day's Office:

“Christ nourishes and supports the Church for which He gave Himself up to death. Let us ask Him:

Remember Your Church, Lord.”

(Msgr.) Vincent Foy
Retired Priest
Archdiocese of Toronto

January 24, 1996
*Feast of St. Francis de Sales,
Patron Saint of Journalists*

5. Novalis, Kung and Truth

Good reading has good effects and bad reading has bad effects. Through reading the greatest of all books, St. Augustine was converted from a life of sin to a life of holiness. Through reading the lives of saints, St. Ignatius of Loyola took his first steps to sanctity. Through bad reading like that of dissident theologians and pornography, many have fallen from faith and grace.

In her Canon law, the Church tries to protect the faithful from bad reading. Canon 827.4 reads: “Books or other written materials dealing with religion or morals may not be displayed, sold or given away in churches or oratories, unless they were published with the permission of the competent ecclesiastical authority or were subsequently approved by that authority.” Other canons opposing bad reading are in *The Code of Canon Law*, under the title “The Means of Social Communication and Books in Particular” (canons 822-832).

Given the wall of protection which the Church raises to protect her sons and daughters from dangerous literature, it was a shock to me to read a recent book review in *The Catholic Register* of “*Disputed Truth, Memoirs II*” by Hans Kung. It is published by the so-called Catholic publisher called Novalis. The Novalis trademark is owned by St. Paul University, Ottawa. The University is responsible, with the Archbishop of Ottawa, for publications carrying the Novalis imprint. Novalis publishes or promotes other books by Hans Kung, e.g. “*My Struggle for Freedom*” and “*On Being a Christian*.”

Research shows that Novalis has also published other works of heterodox teaching. An example is its marriage preparation course “*Mosaic*” (1980, 1986). It called the prohibition of contraception “an ideal” and taught the error of proportionalism, condemned by *Humanae Vitae* (n. 14). It also published for French-speaking Catholics “*Projet Mariage*” (1987), essentially a sexology course. It knew nothing of *Humanae Vitae* or *Familiaris Consortio*.

The works of Hans Kung have done immense harm to the faith. Their errors have penetrated Catholic colleges and seminaries. I recall visiting an English seminary in 1976. In the professors’ lounge, the rector waved a copy of Hans Kung’s “*On Being a Christian*”. He said it was the best thing to come along in a long time. None of the professors objected. I said “Msgr., Hans Kung teaches many errors and is a dissenter from *Humanae Vitae*”. He replied, half jocosely, “I think you are a Vatican spy”. Incidentally, six months later he was named an auxiliary bishop.

In 1979, the Holy See and the German Bishops Conference took away from Hans Kung his license to teach Catholic theology. He was forced to resign from the Catholic faculty at Tübingen. Despite this, Novalis, advertising “*On Being a Christian*” calls Kung “One of the greatest theologians of this century”. In its blurb for “*My Struggle for Freedom*”, Kung is called “a giant of the Christian Church” and “one of the most important theologians of our time”. In describing “*Disputed Truths, Memoirs II*”, Novalis tells us it is “written with the voice of a prophet concerned for the future”.

The heads of Catholic universities are responsible for all media of communications over which they have control. It is their duty to see that nothing is taught that is incompatible with the

Magisterium of the Church. They and those who in any university teach subjects which deal with faith or morals must make a solemn profession of faith (c. 833 of *The Code of Canon Law*). That would certainly pertain to the heads of St. Paul University. To them also would pertain n. 2497 of *The Catechism of the Catholic Church*: “By the very nature of their profession journalists have an obligation to serve the truth and not offend against charity in disseminating information”.

In the words of that great defender of the Faith, Dietrich von Hildebrand, it is “an ignominious betrayal committed by those Catholic Universities, colleges and schools that allow many things to be taught within their walls in blatant contradiction of faith. Such a practice is not only a self-condemnation of these institutions, not only a betrayal of their *raison d’etre*, it is much worse: it is a betrayal of Christ; it is an apostasy masked by the slogan of ‘academic freedom’” (Dietrich von Hildebrand, *The Charitable Anathema*, Roman Catholic Books, 1993, p. 116). Surely these words apply also to enterprises which support false doctrine.

The review of Hans Kung’s latest book in *The Catholic Register*, is written by its Editor and Publisher, Joseph Sinasac. He concludes his review with the words “But the Church needs people like Kung even when they are wrong and disagreeable. Sometimes they can also be right.” I suggest that the Church, repository of the fullness of revelation, needs Hans Kung like it needs a dose of poison!

What the Church needs is proclaimers and guardians of the Truth.

Pope John Paul II called truth “the deepest necessity of the human spirit” (World Youth Day, Aug. 19, 1989).

In writing his second letter, St. John the Apostle gave the advice: “If any one comes to you and does not bring the doctrine (of Christ) do not receive him into the house, or give him any greeting; for he who greets him shares his wicked work”.

St. Paul spoke of “The Church of the living God, which upholds the Truth and keeps it safe”.

Christ, before Pilate, said “This is why I have come into the world, to bear witness to the Truth; and anyone who is on the side of Truth listens to My voice” (John 18:37).

It is the Truth lived which gives us the freedom of the sons and daughters of God.

We ought to pray for the conversion to Catholicism of Novalis.

1.2.2 Postscripts

1. A few days after I had written the above, I learned that on Oct. 1, 2008, Saint Paul University sold Novalis to Bayard of Canada. Bayard of Canada is a sister company of Bayard of France, a large multinational Catholic publishing company. The Augustinians of the Assumption Fathers of Quebec City own eighty-six percent of Bayard of Canada.

Will Bayard of Canada purge Novalis of any books unfaithful to the Magisterium? It would seem that the chances are remote without the intervention of the responsible ecclesiastical authority. Since 2000, Bayard has been handling the distribution and marketing of Novalis books and magazines.

2. From his latest book it is evident that Kung remains bitter towards Pope Benedict XVI. After Cardinal Ratzinger was elected Pope, Kung asked for a meeting. The Holy Father met him at Castel Gandolfo for four hours in late September of 2005. It was mutually agreed that they would not discuss “persistent doctrinal differences”. They talked about Faith, science and world ethics, and the secularization in European countries like Ireland, Germany and Spain. There has been no follow up. When Kung’s license to teach Catholic theology was removed in 1979, he called Cardinal Ratzinger the ‘regressive Grand Inquisitor of the post Vatican Council period.’”

November 20, 2008

6. Answering the Call to Holiness

On Saturday November 10, 2001, at De La Salle Oaklands College School, Canadian Catholics were privileged to participate in the third annual conference sponsored by Call to Holiness Canada. This movement was inspired by its American parent-group organized in Detroit in response to the Call to Action movement, which continues to attack Catholic teachings on faith and morals.

The Call to Holiness movement defends and supports the Magisterium of the Church by prayer, education and evangelization. It exists to remind us all that, in the words of St. Paul, "You are not called to immortality, but to holiness." The theme of this year's conference was "Building Holy Families". Father Paul Dobson gave an inspiring homily on this topic at the Mass celebrated by Bishop Robert Clune. The first talk was given by Professor Donald De Marco, brilliant writer and lecturer, on the subject "Virtue and the Family." In the afternoon participants were privileged to hear Mrs. Lisa Contini of Massina, NY, founder of Aletheia Press, dedicated to the Holy Family. She gave a moving and inspiring and insightful talk entitled "Reverence Leads to Holiness." Deacon Dr. Bob McDonald inspired all with a love of their Faith in his lecture "The Catholic Family: the Little Church."

The Conference was set in a program of liturgy and prayer, with Father Stephen Somerville as master of ceremonies. There were opening prayers and the Rosary before Mass. In the afternoon, between lectures, there was a recitation of the chaplet of Divine Mercy. At the conclusion was Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. All day there was the opportunity of Eucharistic Adoration and the Sacrament of Reconciliation. It is not surprising that the atmosphere was one of joy and thanksgiving.

Already plans are underway for next year's conference on the theme: "Mary and the Call to Holiness." All interested contact John Stone. May many answer this "Call to Holiness".

7. On Gregory Baum

The intention of this article is to protect the faithful from being deceived.

Recently there has been a flurry of references to Gregory Baum, all of them laudatory. An article by Gregory Baum entitled “Vatican II – The Church in dialogue” appeared in the January-February issue of the *Scarboro Missions* magazine. This article is riddled with false doctrine.

None of these references make mention of the theological errors of Gregory Baum, yet he has done more than any person to harm the Church in Canada in my opinion. His Marxist background and activities are described in detail in a four-page bulletin “Herald of Freedom” April 6, 1974. It is entitled “Rev. Gregory Baum – Canada’s Marxist Pope.” In 1996, in a failed attempt to prevent his talk at the Newman Centre of the University of Toronto, I compiled a fourteen-page list of some of his errors entitled “Notes on Gregory Baum.”

It would take a large book to list and describe the errors and misconduct of Gregory Baum. Here I mention a few of them; there are many others.

Contraception

A focal point of Baum’s efforts was in opposition to the teaching of the Church against contraception. In 1964, Herder and Herder published the book “Contraception and Holiness.” It was presented as a “balanced perceptive declaration of Christian dissent”. Among the contributors were three professors of St. Michael’s College in Toronto: Gregory Baum O.S.A., Stanley Kutz C.S.B. (an admitted homosexual who later left the priesthood) and Leslie Dewart, an atheist. An article reporting an interview with Gregory Baum was printed in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of April 9, 1966. It was entitled “Catholics May Use Contraceptives Now.” A year later Baum said that even if the Pope came out against contraception his decision would be irrelevant (*Globe and Mail*, 1967).

After the Pope’s encyclical *Humanae Vitae* reiterated the Church’s condemnation of contraception in 1968, Baum was like a whirling dervish in his hyperactivity against the encyclical. He spoke in Canada and in the United States. On August 1, 1968, the *Globe and Mail* had a feature article by him “Catholics May Follow their Conscience”. In the August 23 issue of the US Catholic Weekly *Commonweal* magazine, there was his article “The Right to Dissent”. The September issue of the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* carried his “The New Encyclical on Contraception” where he attacked the Pope for going against the experience of vast numbers of Catholics and the witness of other Christian churches.

Homosexuality

Gregory Baum openly advocated same-sex “marriage”. In *Commonweal* for February 15, 1974, he wrote an article on homosexuality in which he declared that Catholic teaching on homosexuality would change and embrace homosexuality within a few years. Homosexual activists used this article as a handout for almost two decades throughout North America. In

speaking to Dignity and other homosexual groups, he encouraged them to remain in the Church but to work for a change in the Church's teaching.

Devotion to Mary

In the early sixties, I attended a dinner at Osgoode Hall under the auspices of the Catholic Lawyers Guild. Gregory Baum spoke on the exaggerated "Cultus" of Mary in the Catholic Church. He stated that there was no evidence of devotion to Mary before the fourth century. At the time, I had been reading a section of the book "Mariology" edited by Juniper Carol, O.F.M. on the "The Origins of Marian Cult". It gave numerous examples of devotion to Mary in the first three centuries. Mary herself proclaims in the Magnificat (Luke 1: 46-55): "All generations will call me blessed." Baum discouraged recitation of the Rosary.

Dissent and Rejection of Authority

Msgr. George Kelly wrote in "The Battle for the American Church" pp. 448-9: "Gregory Baum argued that Rome's grip on the Church can be loosened by careful violation of law. In Baum's view freedom from Rome's law can be obtained by seizing it in the knowledge that violations will go unpunished."

The Priesthood

I conducted about twenty of the first priest-laicization processes for the Archdiocese of Toronto. A number of priests said that they were encouraged to leave the priesthood by Gregory Baum. He promoted the concept of a temporary or "existential" priesthood. In an article printed in the *Toronto Star* of April 23, 1966, Baum stated that he was not alarmed at the large numbers of priests and religious departing from their vocations. He said "By assigning the laity a higher place in the Christian Church, the whole matter of the role of the clergy has to be re-thought."

A Report to the Archbishop

I was pastor of St. John's Church on Kingston Rd in Toronto in 1966. In the parish there was a convent of Notre Dame Sisters. I received a phone call from the Superior of the Notre Dame Sisters, who was in Ottawa. She told me that one of the younger Sisters, studying at St. Michael's College, was obliged by Gregory Baum to attend a weekend retreat near Orangeville. This was before the mitigation of Friday abstinence. Meat was served on Friday evening. "The Sister said 'Fr. Baum, this is Friday and you are serving meat'. He replied 'Sister, here I am Pope. Eat your meat!' In the course of the weekend, he encouraged immoral familiarities between male and female religious. You must report this to Archbishop Pocock". I suggested that she report this to the Apostolic Delegate in Ottawa. "No," she replied "Sister is in your parish and you should report it".

The next day I made a report on the matter to Archbishop Pocock. He threw up his hands and said "What can I do?" I said he could suspend Baum. He did nothing and allowed Baum to continue teaching at St. Michael's College for another nine years.

Suspension and Excommunication

When the *Declaration on Certain Questions Concerning Sexual Ethics* was issued by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on December 29, 1975, Gregory Baum criticized it severely. He said “The concept of sex only within marriage was no longer adequate. Even if marriage is the ideal, this does not mean there is no responsible context of sexual relations for mature single people, the widowed and the divorced.” In response, Archbishop Pocock suspended Baum from hearing confessions.

In the issue for January 14, 1978, the *Catholic Register* reported that “Gregory Baum, noted Canadian theologian and outspoken critic of the Church, married a former nun in a private ceremony recently in Montreal... the bride is Shirley Flynn, who left her religious order about fifteen years ago.” According to Canon 2388 of the *Code of Canon Law* in force at that time, Gregory Baum was automatically excommunicated.

It is difficult to understand why articles by Baum should continue to appear in Catholic periodicals; why he should be praised in others; why he should be invited to speak in Catholic institutions such as St. Paul’s University in Ottawa and why this arch-heretic should be highly praised in an interview given him recently by a Catholic priest currently posted on a website.

8. Teilhard de Chardin: Arch-Heretic

Pope Pius XII called the writings of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin “a cesspool of errors.” The Church’s condemnation of his writings remains in force.

Unfortunately, in *The Catholic Register* of Toronto for Feb. 3, 2012, there is a front full-page picture of de Chardin with the inscription “Studying the origins of the universe – The brilliance and spirituality of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin brought to life on stage.” On page ten is an article by Michael Swan with a favorable review of a play “The De Chardin Project” by actor and writer Adam Seybold, who belongs to “a liberal Protestant Church.” We are misinformed that de Chardin was a brilliant thinker who articulated the first positive Christian response to evolutionary theory. We are further told that today his thoughts on cosmology and evolution form that basis of contemporary [so-called] “Catholic” theologies of the environment.

The Life and Erroneous Writings of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin

This is a much-condensed treatment of his life and writings:

1. He was born in south central France on May 1, 1881.
2. He was educated at the Jesuit College at Mongre and joined the Society of Jesus in 1899.
3. He continued philosophy and seminary education from 1901-05. This was followed by a three-year sojourn to Cairo, Egypt, where he taught physics and chemistry at a Jesuit school and developed his interest in paleontology. He went to England in 1908, studied theology and was ordained in 1911.
4. He returned to Paris and studied paleontology and took a doctorate in 1922.
5. For a short period he taught at the Catholic Institute in Paris but his unorthodox views, especially his rejection of Original Sin, led to his expulsion. He was exiled to China in 1923.
6. In 1926, his Superior forbade him to teach.
7. In 1933, the Holy See in Rome ordered him to give up his subsequent post in Paris.
8. In 1939, the Holy See banned his work “*L’Énergie Humaine*.”
9. In 1941, de Chardin submitted to Rome “*Le Phénomène Humain*.” Its publication was forbidden.
10. In 1947, Rome also forbade him to write or teach on philosophical subjects.
11. In 1948, he was called to Rome and persisted in trying to get permission to publish “*Le Phénomène Humain*.” The Holy See renewed its’ prohibition of this work and forbade him to teach at the College de France.
12. In 1949, permission to publish “*Le Groupe Zoologique*” was also refused.
13. In 1955, his Superiors forbade de Chardin to attend the International Congress on Paleontology. That same year, de Chardin died in New York on Easter Sunday.
14. On June 30, 1962, a Monitum was given at Rome by the Holy Office: “It is sufficiently clear that the above mentioned works abound in such ambiguities and indeed even serious errors, as to offend Catholic doctrine. For this reason, the most eminent and most reverend Fathers of the Holy Office exhort all Ordinaries as well as Superiors of Religious Institutes, rectors of

- seminaries and presidents of universities, effectively to protect the minds, particularly of the youth, against the dangers presented by the works of Teilhard de Chardin and his followers.”
15. In 1963, the Cardinal Vicar of Rome, in the name of Pope Paul VI, ordered that booksellers in Rome withdraw from circulation the works of de Chardin together with those books which favour his erroneous doctrines.
 16. In 1967, in a reply to a question raised by the Apostolic Delegate to the United States concerning the previous Monitum condemning the works of de Chardin, the Holy See reiterated: “I wish to assure you that the Monitum issued by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith is still in effect. At no time has a distinction been made with regard to any one of his writings.”
 17. On July 20, 1981, the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office printed a Statement in *L'Osservatore Romano* reiterating the warning of the 1962 banning of the writings of Teilhard “against rumours that it no longer applied.”

Church Teaching vs. the Errors of Teilhard de Chardin

Teilhard’s writings are full of heretical untruths condemned by the Church. Besides denying the Church’s infallible Doctrine of Original Sin (*Catechism of the Catholic Church* 385-421, 1440,1871-72), he did not believe in the supernatural, angels, the devil or hell. De Chardin was also a pantheist, who claimed that everything is God. The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* paragraph 285 states: “Since the beginning the Christian faith has been challenged by responses to the question of origins that differ from its own. Ancient religions and cultures produced many myths concerning origins. Some philosophers have said that everything is God, that the world is God, or that the development of the world is the development of God (Pantheism).” In addition, Teilhard was a monist, a collectivist, a secularist, founder of a new religion and a religious evolutionist. (cf. “*The Truth About Teilhard*”, by Msgr. Leo S. Schumacher).

As a religious evolutionist, Teilhard erroneously claimed that everything is “becoming” and evolving and that God is evolving. Patrick Redmond of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars is the author of the book “*From Adam and Eve to the Present*” (Ave Maria Press, 2012). In it he notes, that DNA can be scientifically traced back to our first parents, one man and one woman, which confirms Church doctrine that human beings were created by God, beginning with Adam and Eve, and they did not evolve from lower animals.

In an article published in the *Journal of the Canadian Chapter of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars*, Summer-Fall 2010, Redmond tells us:

“The Church has had a long tradition of confirming that God created all from nothing, and we note here Lateran IV (1215), Vatican I (1859) and Pope Pius XII’s *Humani Generis*. This last document, issued in 1950, states: discussion about the possibility of evolution of man from pre-existing matter is permitted. However this discussion was to be restricted and limited only to those experts in the human sciences and sacred theology and these same experts were specifically forbidden to teach as an established fact that man’s body evolved from a lower animal.”

Redmond continues: “Some Catholics dissent from this position. Teilhard de Chardin, was a notable dissident, a very influential theologian and heretic of the 20th century. Teilhard, while still a Jesuit student, became a member of the exclusive Count Begouen circle at Toulouse, the object of which was to propagate Darwin’s theory in France and to introduce it into the Catholic seminaries of Europe. He became one of the most active propagandists for the evolutionists.”

“Indeed, he became involved in at least two frauds claiming man evolved from a lower animal form of life. One was the Piltdown Man, used for 40 years to claim evolution, until proven to be deceptively stained human teeth. A second was the Peking Man, discovered while he worked at Peking Union Medical College funded by the Rockefeller Institute. Peking Man was shown eventually to be a monkey.”

While Catholics are free to believe in a theory of maxi-evolution, it is not proven and only a theory. There remains no proof of even one species evolving into another species. There is much proof of mini-evolution or changes within species.

Canada and the Spread of de Chardin’s New Religion

The errors of de Chardin have been widely spread in Canada by articles, lectures and in retreats, produced by individuals from Canada, the US and other places. For example, on Jan. 16, 2012, www.catholic.org advertised a “Free – Retreat with Teilhard de Chardin by Fr. Donald Goergen, O.P., Ph.D” in three CDs, produced by “Now Your Know Media”. We read “Through 6 audio conferences Fr. Goergen guides you through the mysticism of Teilhard, one of the greatest theological minds of the 20th century.”

Perhaps the most damaging vehicle of the errors of de Chardin has been the Canadian Catechism. The first edition of this was called “*Viens au Pere*,” disseminated in Quebec. Incidentally, 70 parishes have closed in Montreal recently so we can see the fruits of this and the contraceptive mentality. The catechists who composed this catechism were trained in a Catechetical School in Europe in which all the teachers were Jesuit followers of Teilhard de Chardin. This catechism was translated into English as “*Come to the Father*” and later named “*Born of the Spirit*”.

This catechism downplays Original Sin and the supernatural, including the existence of hell and mortal sin. As a result, many thousands of Catholic children have become religious illiterates. A Hamilton Sister of St. Joseph studied catechetics at the Pontifical Catechetical School at Erie, PA. She wrote her doctoral thesis showing the influence of de Chardin on the Canadian Catechism. Unfortunately the School closed and the thesis was lost. The author died and I was able to obtain only a portion of this excellent analysis.

“For there shall be a time, when they will not endure sound doctrine; but, according to their own desires, they will heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears” (2 Tim 4:3). The errors of de Chardin continue to be propagated by such articles as that in *The Catholic Register* of Toronto.

A Brief Bibliography on the Errors of Teilhard

Besides the pontifical sources noted above, this is by no means a complete bibliography exposing the heresies in his works, but a representable one:

1. *Humani Generis*, Pope Pius XII, August 12, 1950, www.vatican.va
2. “*Teilhard, Evolution and the Catholic Church*”, reprinted from the Mindszenty Report, April 1977, PO Box 11321, Saint Louis, MO 63105; www.creationism.org/csshs/v14n4p22.htm.
3. “*Christ Denied*”, Fr. Paul Wickens, 1982, Tan Books and Publishers. It contains a detailed record of Ecclesiastical decisions regarding the person and writings of Teilhard de Chardin.
4. “*Teilhardism and the New Religion – A Thorough Analysis of the Teachings of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin*”, Wolfgang Smith, 1988, Tan Books and Publishers Inc, PO Box 424, Rockford, IL, 61105.
5. “*The Charitable Anathema*”, Dietrich von Hildebrand, 1993, Roman Catholic Books, PO Box 255, Harrison, NY, 10528. Chapter XX is entitled “Teilhard de Chardin: Towards a New Religion.” Von Hildebrand exposes how Teilhard was a false prophet.
6. “*In the Minds of Men: Darwin and the New World Order*”, Ian Taylor, professor at the University of Toronto, 2003, TFE Publishing, 5th Ed., Zimmerman, MN. This book analyzes evolution and explains the error of theistic evolution. Available free online at: www.creationism.org/books/TaylorInMindsMen/index.htm
7. “*Theistic Evolution: The Teilhardian Heresy*”, Wolfgang Smith, 2102, Angelico Press, www.angelicopress.com, ISBN: 13: 978-1597311335, Price: \$16.95.