

To His Eminence Gerhard Cardinal Müller,
Prefect of the Congregation for Doctrine and Faith
Palazzo S. Uffizio
Piazza del S. Uffizio, 11
00193 Roma
Italy

08.09.2016 - Birth of the Blessed Virgin Mary

Your Eminence,

Re: the interpretation of the term “failure” regarding Council’s infallibility

Herewith I wish to express my sincere and profound gratitude for granting me the opportunity for meetings with your Congregation in October 2015 and last June 2016. I especially appreciate meeting you personally in June 2016.

The discussions with your collaborators were very informative and instructive.

However, despite this, I am observing a fundamental problem concerning the interpretation of the term “failure” regarding a Council’s infallibility.

I have therefore re-edited and extended my paper “*Risk-analysis of Vatican II*” ([Draft version 07/09/2016](#)), especially ref. 1 addressing this subject which I added hereby as attachment 1. Please find also attached the revised draft paper (attachment 2).

The core of the matter may be succinctly stated as follows: *“the Holy Father or an Ecumenical Council are infallible, when they pronounce on Faith or Morals a definitive statement (dogma) which must be accepted by every Catholic, or when they present an infallible teaching on Faith and Morals of the Ordinary Magisterium”*. All other statements or teachings might be fallible and can therefore fail in potency. Suggesting that a Council cannot fail is consequently stating that any Ecumenical Council might be infallible in itself. This undermines the true teaching of infallibility. Thus, while the Second Vatican Council explicitly made clear that it did not even want to pronounce any new dogma, nowadays this Council seems to be declared as an infallible dogma in itself as if it presents an infallible teaching on Faith and Morals of the Ordinary Magisterium only.

With this conclusion in mind and after the meeting in October 2015, I proposed an approach to this problem using the well-defined concept from the world of structural engineering risk analysis, which I have revised nowadays after the last meeting in June 2016.

Additionally, during the meeting last June your collaborator commented that I should make clear that while the interpretation of a Council can fail, a Council cannot fail. We can forgive him for his lack of precision, but a failing interpretation, by necessity, has its sources in unclear texts produced by the Council Fathers. We cannot avoid the reality of the ambiguous and even contradictory texts/phrases combined with the fallible statements that were simply not meant to be infallible. Furthermore, in case of accepting the contradictory compromises systematically is consequently accepting these logical contradictions as source for ongoing and unresolvable conflicts in the Church. This conclusion in itself is clear evidence of the entire situation being contrary to the working of the Holy Spirit.

Pope Benedict XVI in his preface to the book *‘Joseph Ratzinger, Zur Lehre des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils’*, very clearly draw specific attention to failures of Vatican II. That he should write such statements as reigning Pontiff is unprecedented, very significant and of grave concern.

I draw your special attention to the following two points he made:

1. Regarding the terms “today’s world”, “modern era” and “modern world” he wrote: “Behind the vague expression *‘today’s world’* lies the question of the relationship with the *‘modern era’*. To clarify this, it would have been necessary to define more clearly the essential features that constitute the *‘modern era’*. **‘Schema XIII’ did not succeed in doing this.** Although the Pastoral Constitution expressed many important elements for an understanding of the *‘modern world’* and made significant contributions to the question of Christian ethics, **it failed to offer substantial clarification on this point**”.

His Holiness confirmed **the failure of the fallible analysis of the term ‘modern world’** found in *Gaudium et Spes*, *Dignitatis Humanae* and *Nostra Aetate*.

Logically, a thorough analysis is either right or wrong. If that analysis fails for a part that is even more than one Council document, then that same analysis has evidently failed for the whole. **This failed analysis manifests a blindness for Truth among the majority of the Council Fathers that even affects the ‘aggiornamento’ as pastoral goal of the Council.**

2. Regarding ‘religions’ in *Nostra Aetate*: “In the process of active reception, a weakness of this otherwise extraordinary text has gradually emerged: **it speaks of religion solely in a positive way and it disregards the sick and distorted forms of religion** which, from the historical and theological viewpoints, are of far-reaching importance; for this reason the Christian faith, from the outset, adopted a critical stance towards religion, both internally and externally”.

Nostra Aetate expresses only a positive view towards other religions, therefore, presenting a one-sided argument. Due to that it has to be considered as “failed” because it cannot be used properly in any decision-making process without an extremely high risk of incorrect measures. It therefore **manifests a clear blindness for the Truth by a majority of Council Fathers**. Precisely this aspect can be observed as the current key-problem regarding the Islamic State and all other Islamic terror, especially against Christians. Failing to recognize this simple fact is exacerbating this problem from day to day **while it also manifests a clear blindness for the Truth among a lot of post-Council Fathers**. Obviously an accurate interpretation and well balanced interpretation of this Council document in the light of the full *Depositum Fidei* and the Sacred Tradition is urgently needed. To quantify the urgency for this work we may use an analogy with the “Doomsday clock”, where we are now only a few minutes away from midnight.

So the fact that Pope Benedict XVI stated about the Council on the one hand regarding the clarification of the *modern era* that “*it failed to offer substantial clarification on this point*” while on the other hand regarding *Nostra Aetate* “*it disregards the sick and distorted forms of religion*”, in other words for both of these aspects “**it failed in its serviceability to the Truth**”.

I hope these two examples are drawing sufficient attention for a good-understanding of the possible failure modes of the Council.

Therefore, considering that in one way or the other hardly anyone has been affected and wounded by the desperate conflicting situation in the Church due to these failures, a humble request by the Church for Mercy to the Holy Spirit seems to be most urgently required to resolve these failures.

Finally, again, please allow me to express my profound thanks for granting me the meetings with your Congregation. It is with heartfelt gratitude for your consideration regarding this matter, hoping for your support I offer the assurance of my filial support and prayers for your work, for His Holiness, and in hope of a speedy and just resolution of the presented issue. I also ask for the kindness of your blessing.

Best regards

In Christo

Jack P. Oostveen

This letter has been sent by registered mail as well as by electronic mail: segrsott@cfaith.va

Appendices:

1. Reference 1: ”A proper understanding of expressions like failed and risks for failures regarding a Council” (re-edited)
2. “Risk analysis of Vatican II” ([Draft version 07/09/2016](#))

Attachment 1

Ref. 1: A proper understanding of expressions like failed and risks for failures regarding a Council

The Holy Father or an Ecumenical Council are infallible, when they pronounce on Faith or Morals a definitive statement (dogma) which must be accepted by every Catholic, or when they present an infallible teaching on Faith and Morals of the Ordinary Magisterium. So any Council presents both, infallible and fallible teachings.

Apparently, Vatican II did not even want to pronounce any new dogma.

Thus, in case of Vatican II the Council documents contain infallible teaching insofar it concerns the infallible matters of Faith and Morals of the Ordinary Magisterium, and fallible teachings insofar it concerns analyses and matters at the level of the changing reality of the modern world. Precisely, because of these fallible teachings the Council carries the risk of imperfect analysis and characterizations at this underlying changing reality of the modern world, and thereby also the risk of incorrect decisions as to the implementation of the *Depositum Fidei* with all consequences regarding the resulting effects. Some examples of this has been diagnosed from some recent statements by Pope Benedict XVI [Pope Benedict XIV (2012), Preface of 'Joseph Ratzinger, *Zur Lehre des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils.*' Erster Teilband, (Joseph Ratzinger Gesammelte Schriften 7/1)]

Suggesting that all aspects of a Council are infallible, due to the magisterial provisions on issues of Faith and Morals, is absurd. It is equivalent to say that, despite the fact that there may be some fallible teachings, anything resulting from any Council should be infallible and undisputable through and through, and as such has to be considered as a dogma in itself. This unprecedented line of thinking obviously imposes a tremendous risk: fallible decisions may come to be considered as infallible. The Council, in this absurd scenario, is above reproach, as it were deified. This is undermining the status of the true infallibility by the Holy Father and the Ecumenical Council when they pronounce on Faith or Morals a definitive statement (dogma). In fact it makes a mockery of it.

Therefore, for a proper understanding of expressions like *failed* and *risks for failures* regarding a risk analysis of a Council, the following definitions are useful to consider (these come from the professional engineering discipline of failure analysis):

- 1 The **Ultimate Limit State (ULS)** is a type of failure mode where the total functioning of a system has been destroyed. This type of failure is unrecoverable.
- 2 The **Serviceability Limit State (SLS)** is a type of failure mode where one or more distinct elements of a system do not function sufficiently. This kind of failure can be resolved by taking appropriate corrective measures.

When considering a Council an *Ultimate Limit State failure mode* or "*collapse by heresy*" cannot exist, especially regarding the infallibility of *Depositum Fidei* and the *supernatural protection by the Holy Spirit*. Even if Council documents contain a lot of ambiguities, the Holy Spirit, is preventing the Council from absolute heresy and guarantees that the total result can always be interpreted in accordance with the fullness of the *Depositum Fidei* and *Tradition*.

All Council Fathers are required to collaborate graciously concerning the inspiration of the Holy Spirit by an act of free will. Apparently, if a number of individual Council Fathers are lacking such gracious collaboration, the Holy Spirit still respects that free will, but at the same time He will reject these Council Fathers from His inspiration and hit them by blindness. If all Council Fathers collaborated graciously as described above, there would be no ambiguous texts. However, as this was not the case, those who lacked this '*gracious collaboration*' introduced ambiguities into texts, often reflecting some contradictory compromise. In some cases the degree of compromise produced documents that cannot serve, unambiguously, the proper interpretation of the Council with regard to the convoked objectives. Evidently, these ambiguities and contradictory text phrases cannot come from the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of the Truth.

On one hand this can be considered as a *Serviceability Limit State* failure mode at which the Holy Spirit is respecting the free will of man, while on the other hand the Holy Spirit is protecting the Council supernaturally from the *Ultimate Limit State* failure mode by preventing it from absolute heresies, just by these ambiguous and contradictory texts phrases. This is what makes the *Serviceability Limit State* failure mode resolvable by addressing appropriate corrective measures in gracious collaboration with the Holy Spirit, and finally into a successful Council.

It would seem that the *Serviceability Limit State* failure mode has been reached due to Council Fathers disgracing the Holy Spirit and being the source of the ambiguities and contradictory text phrases in the Council documents by which these texts are open for false interpretations and incorrect (pastoral) measures to be implemented. The phenomenon of failing interpretations is factually proving the existence of the *Serviceability Limit State* failure mode.

On one hand, the more Council Fathers disgrace the Holy Spirit through their free will, the more risks on blindness among the Council Fathers appears and the more ambiguities are present in the Council Documents as well as the greater the risk that the convoked objectives of the Council cannot be achieved. On the other hand as long as these ambiguities have not been addressed well by appropriate corrective measures, the convoked objective(s) of a Council cannot be achieved.

Thus the term “*risk for failure of Vatican IP*” means here the risk for a *Serviceability Limit State* failure mode, by which the Council documents lack the service for clear understanding of the documents due to ambiguity as a source for incorrect interpretation by which potentially incorrect measures can be taken and the convoked objective, the New Evangelisation, fails.